

HYDERABAD OR INDIA

HYDERABAD

OR

INDIA

BY

K. L. GAUBA

RAJKAMAL PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
DELHI

First Printing September, 1948
All rights reserved.

Price Rupees Three and Annas Eight only

Printed by M. L. Sabharwall at the Roxy Press, New Delhi, and
published by Rajkamal Publications Limited, Delhi.

CONTENTS

| | | | |
|--|----|----|-----|
| 1. Treason founds a Kingdom | .. | .. | 1 |
| 2. His Highness the Subedar | .. | .. | 17 |
| 3. The " Faithful Ally " | .. | .. | 32 |
| 4. Hyderabad | .. | .. | 46 |
| 5. The fiction of Sovereignty | .. | .. | 64 |
| 6. The Miracle | .. | .. | 87 |
| 7. Fire-eaters at Large | .. | .. | 109 |
| 8. An Experimental Marriage | .. | .. | 119 |
| 9. Hyderabad, Pakistan and the Middle East | .. | .. | 133 |
| 10. Hyderabad or India | .. | .. | 142 |

PREFACE.

To establish Pakistan, Jinnah poisoned the wells of ideology in India. Two dominions instead of one were established. Murder, rape, arson and genocide were the first fruits of freedom.

And now Hyderabad.

The rulers of Hyderabad, who have for years drunk deeply of the ideology that gave us Pakistan, threaten consequences worse than the holocaust of 1947, if there is any serious attempt by the Indian Union to interfere with what they refer to as the "independence" and "sovereignty" of the State. What they really want is the right to do as they please.

Since the advent of Independence, more than five hundred Rulers have made way for the rule of their people. Not so the Nizam. With less legal pretensions than many others of his Order, he alone clings to the past; and he scans the horizon for allies—Churchill and the British Conservative Party, Pakistan and Syria, Razakars and Indian Fifth Columnists.

To what extent is the Nizam's claim to sovereignty well founded? In whom does it vest? In the Nizam? In his people? Or in Abdul Kasim Razvi?

Or is the sovereignty claimed by the Nizam anything more than a fiction? Is His Exalted

Highness anything other than Mir Osman Ali Khan, pretender to the "throne" of Hyderabad ?

These are some questions to which answers are sought in the present book. To find the answers we have to travel some distance back on the road of history. To assess the value of the demands of Osman Ali, we must begin our researches with Asaf Jah Kamruddin, nor hesitate to recall the achievements of the illustrious ancestors of His Highness. Some of the details may inevitably be dull, but the results will be found to be startling.

Most people take the legal status of Hyderabad for granted. Lord Mountbatten, in his address to the Chamber of Princes in July 1947, used loose expressions of the "complete freedom" and "legal and technical" "independence" of the States after the Act of Independence. The Nizam can therefore be excused when he claims for himself the exaggerated status of an independent sovereign, forgetting that the Independence Act not only abrogated the Paramountcy but also all treaties and matters and rights based on agreements, sanads and usage. When history is written off, what remains ? Far from the Nizam having claims upon India, India may have well-based claims upon the Nizam.

In some detail, therefore, is examined in these pages the historical foundations of the Hyderabad State, the events and circumstances that went to the making of Moghul outpost into a British Dependency.

Recent events, including the long drawn out negotiations, cannot be viewed in isolation. No clear understanding of the Hyderabad problem is possible without viewing it against the background of other matters : British policy in the Middle East ; Tory

backing and Jinnah's search for money and allies ; the Nizam's riches ; and above all India's deep anxiety to avoid an open conflict.

India has time out of number declared that no state will be coerced into accession. The Nizam has also time out of number declared that he will never accept accession. In India, accession and responsible government are two *sine qua nons* of a settlement with the Nizam. Weeks of the most patient negotiation have failed to produce a solution.

Short of coercion, therefore, is there anything left where Hyderabad is concerned ? Is the Government of India pledged to be an idle spectator, while the Nizam is free to use British planes, Australian pilots, Swiss arms, Arab mercenaries and Pakistan bases ?

These are some of the important matters that call for our attention.

Razvi has promised to run up the Nizam's flag on the Red Fort at Delhi if the Indian Dominion is so stupid as to wage war upon the Nizam. To most people the only likelihood of Razvi's threat maturing is if the Indian Government is stupid enough to believe him.

K. L. G.

Fort Chambers,
Bombay ;
August 27, 1948.

CHAPTER I

TREASON FOUNDS A KINGDOM

Hyderabad, which today claims recognition in a class apart from other Indian States, its ruler styled His Exalted Highness and Britain's Faithful Ally, attained this distinction, says Edward Thompson in his "Making of the Indian Princes," "entirely by the fact that it became very early a *tulchan* kingdom, straw-stuffed and held upright by the Company, except for a very brief period of forgetfulness, when a whiff of hostility from the Marathas was allowed to blow it down."

Unlike the Marathas, the State had neither racial nor religious cohesion. It was the creation of Kamaruddin Asaf Jah, the Emperor's Wazir, who in 1724, after the Emperor's death withdrew to it as Subedar (Overseer) of the Deccan and freed himself from all but nominal dependence on his master, in the same period as that in which the leading Maratha chiefs established themselves. And as will appear, "in the stormy days that followed, Hyderabad was saved only by the coming of the British."

The foundations of Hyderabad were thus laid in treason and duplicity.

Akbar had carried the Moghal Empire south as far as what is now Aurangabad, when he was recalled to Delhi. Under Aurangzeb, the Moghal Domains reached their zenith. In 1683, Aurangzeb marched into the Deccan to crush the rising power of the Marathas and to reduce to submission the other

Kingdoms of Southern India. In 1686, he conquered Bijapur, in the following year Golconda, the whole of the Carnatic and Telingana.

In 1703 the Emperor appointed Kamaruddin Asaf Jah as his Nizam and Subedar of the Deccan. Kamaruddin who had so far rendered distinguished service to the Emperor, saw in his appointment the opportunity to render distinguished service to himself.

Delhi, in the early eighteenth century, was several weeks' journey from the Deccan. The death of the Emperor Aurangzeb in 1707 signalled the weakening of Moghal Power in India.

When Aurangzeb died, the usual fratricidal war that followed the death of a Moghal Emperor broke out. Shah Alam, the eldest son, eventually succeeded under the title of Bahadur Shah ; and Zulfikar Khan who had been Viceroy of the Deccan in the reign of Aurangzeb, and to whose influence Bahadur Shah greatly owed his elevation, was appointed prime minister. Bahadur Shah reigned for five years.

Just as nearly two hundred years later, one of his descendants would see in the opportunity of the times an occasion to declare himself independent, Kamaruddin endeavoured to shake off the control of the Delhi Court, though he never actively ventured to declare himself the independent ruler. According to all canons of law, Kamaruddin's conduct was nevertheless an act of treason, for which in more ordered times he might well have paid with his head.

If Kamaruddin Asaf Jah's ambition was to set up a kingdom in the South to rival the Moghal Empire

in the North, nature and circumstances conspired to defeat his plans.

Neither neighbours, nor foreign powers, recognised Kamaruddin Asaf Jah as an independent ruler. Kamaruddin's act acquired no international recognition or status, as for a century and more the Nizams continued to pay obeisance—normal perhaps—to the Emperors of Delhi.

Kamaruddin himself died in 1748 when rot sent in the family fortunes. Gaziuddin Khan, eldest son of Kamaruddin, was in Delhi, so Nasir Jung, his younger brother, seized the Nizamate on the death of his father. The British, always ready to support imposters, lent ready aid to Nasir Jung, whose claim to the Nizamate was disputed by members of his own family. Absentee Gaziuddin's claims were advanced by Muzzaffar Jang, a nephew, through a sister, with French aid. The British saw in the establishment of Nasir Jung the means of securing British influence in the Deccan. No doubt Dupleix, the Governor of the French Settlements, was inspired by no more better motives.

At first the French had it their way. Gaziuddin in 1751 with Maratha aid disputed the accession and endeavoured to secure the Subedarship. Nasir Jung was murdered, and Gaziuddin became Nizam. He did not, however, survive long. He too was murdered and died from the effect of poisoning a short while later.

Muzzaffar Jang to secure his position applied to the French for help. Nothing could be more pleasing to Dupleix than this since he saw that it gave him an opportunity of furthering his great project of founding a European Empire in India.

Should he be successful in this, he might take the place of the Great Moghal in Southern India, and have a Nawab of the Carnatic and a Viceroy of the Deccan ruling under him. The united armies of Dupleix, Muzzaffar and Chanda Sahib marched into the Carnatic, defeated Nawab Anwar-ud-din at Ambur, and left him dead on the field. They then advanced to Arcot, and Chanda Sahib was proclaimed Nawab of the Carnatic. Mohammad Ali, the son of Anwar-ud-din, fled with the remnant of his army to Trichinopoly.

Good fortune followed Dupleix. Jinji, the strongest fortress in the Carnatic—the scene of many a contest between the Maratha and Moghal—was taken by the intrepid and victorious Bussy. Nasir Jung was shot by his own followers. Chanda Sahib and Muzzaffar Jang proceeded to Pondicherry where they were received with the wildest joy. Salutes were fired, and a “Te Deum” was sung, Muzzaffar Jang was installed Viceroy of the Deccan with the greatest pomp; Dupleix was appointed Governor of India from the Kistna to Cape Comorin, was entrusted with the command of seven thousand horses, and presented with money to the value of twenty lakhs, and also with many valuable jewels. Chanda Sahib was appointed Nawab of the Carnatic under the authority of Dupleix.

Muzzaffar Jang did not enjoy his high position long. On his return to the Deccan his troops mutinied and he was killed. Bussy, who had gone with him amid the acclamations of the army, appointed as his successor Salabat Jang, a younger son of Muzzaffar Jang who had become Nizam-ul-Mulk under the French aegis. Dupleix's policy had been completely successful. To commemorate his triumph, he erected a column bearing an inscription proclaiming his glory

to all the nations, and built a city around it and called it Dupleix-fattih-abad, "The City of the Victory of Dupleix".

Muzzaffar Jang had thus the field left clear to himself and after his accession received into his service a body of French troops under the Command of Bussy and assigned to the French large territories near Pondicherry, the Province of Karaikal and the town and district of Masulipatam.

Salabat Jah confirmed the French in many privileges enjoyed by them. He also assigned to Dupleix several districts in the Northern Circars for the pay and equipment of French auxiliaries in his service.

In 1756, war broke out between France and England and was extensively exploited to extend the British domains in India. The French were driven from the Northern Circars by an English Force. Salabat Jah tried to secure return of these Provinces but withdrew his demands discreetly as he was now without French aid.

Three years later Salabat Jah abandoned his French proclivities and concluded a treaty with the British whereby he ceded an area of about 700 square miles including the sea fort of Masulipatam and undertook to exclude the French from his dominions. The Treaty was in Hyderabad tradition to be the mightiest. According to the Treaty of the 14th May 1759/16th Ramzan 1172 AH therefore :

"The whole of the Circars of Masulipatam, with eight districts, as well as the Circar of Nizampatam, and the districts of Condavir and Wacalmanner, shall be given to the

English Company as an *enam* (or free gift), and the Sunnuds granted to them in the same manner as was done to the French.

“The Nawab Salabat Jang will oblige the French troops which are in his country to pass the river Ganges within fifteen days ; or send them to Pondicherry, or to any other place out of the Deccan country, on the other side of the river Kistna ; in future he will not suffer them to have a settlement in this country, on any account whatsoever, nor keep them in his service, nor assist them, nor call them to his assistance.”

The legal value of Salabat Jang's act of cession by gift being dubious approval of the acquisition of the Northern Circars was sought by the Company from the Emperor of Delhi. This was forthcoming. On the 14th August 1765 when the Dewani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa was also obtained by the English Company, Salabat Jang's 'gift' of the Sircars were also confirmed. Said the Royal decree :

“In these happy times, our Firman, full of splendour and worthy of obedience is descended, purporting, that whereas Salabat Jung Bahadoor, Soubadar of the Deccan, conferred the Circar of Siccacole, etc., on the French Company, and that in consequence of its not being confirmed by us, either by Firman or otherwise, the high, mighty, glorious Chiefs of the Khans, chosen of the Omrahs, Sepoy Sirdars, truly faithful, worthy of receiving favours and obligations, our invariable and never-failing friends and well-wisher, the English Company (having sent a large

force for that purpose) did expel the French therefrom ; we, therefore, in consideration of the fidelity and good wishes of the above high, mighty, etc., etc., English Company, have, from our throne, the basis of the world, given them the aforementioned Circars, by way of *enam* or free gift (without the least participation of any person whatever in the same), from the beginning of the Fussul of Tuccancooul, in the year of Phasely 1172, equal to the month of April 1762 ; it is incumbent, therefore, on you, our sons, Omrahs, Viziers, Governors, Mootsuddees, for the affairs of Dewanship, Mootecophile, for those of our kingdom, jaghiredars, and karorees, both now and hereafter, for ever and ever, to use your endeavours in the strengthening and carrying into execution this our most high command, and to cede and give up to the abovementioned English Company, their heirs and descendants, for ever and ever the aforesaid Circars, and esteeming them likewise free, exempt, and safe from all displacing or removal, by no means whatever either molest, or trouble them on account of the Dewan's office or those of our Imperial Court.

“ Looking upon this high Firman as an absolute and positive order, obey it implicitly.”

Salabat Jah suffered the fate of his predecessors. He was deposed by his younger brother Nizam Ali, imprisoned and eventually murdered in prison. Nizam Ali assumed the lofty titles of Nawab

Asaf Jah Nizam-ul-Mulk Nizamud Dawla, Mir Nizam Ali Khan Bahadur. He ravaged the Carnatic but was driven back. In 1766 on the 9th of the Moon, Jamad-us Sanee (1180:12-11-1766) he secured himself in his estate by an allowance with the British Raj ceding to the East India Company and their heirs in free gift for ever and ever the Circars of Ellour, Siccale, Rajamundry, Moortapur Naga, Guntur and Murtyanagar. In return the British Government agreed to finance the Nizam "as consideration for the gift" with a subsidiary force when required and to pay nine lakhs a year when the assistance of their troops was not required. The Circar of Guntur, which the Nizam had given to his brother Basalat Jung, was not to be taken possession of till the latter's death, except in the event of his creating disturbances in the Carnatic. Under article I of the said treaty the two contracting parties (the Nizam on the one hand and the East India Company by General John Calliaud on the other) by virtue of the treaty of honour, favour, alliance of friendship solemnly engaged a mutual assistance to esteem the enemies of one the enemies of both and contrarywise the friends of one the friends of both."

When the French and Haider Ali of Mysore however, threatened British Power, Nizam Ali's pledges proved little better than his conscience. Much as Kamaruddin Asaf Jah turned his back upon his benefactors at Delhi, his grandson treacherously deserted the British alliance so recently entered into. The Nizam invaded the Carnatic in conjunction with Haider Ali of Mysore with whom the British were on hostile terms.

In 1767 Haider Ali was intriguing with the French against the English, and consequently the latter entered into an agreement with the Marathas and

Nizam Ali to attack Mysore. If the plan of this "Triple Alliance" had been carried out, Mysore would have been attacked at once from all sides; Haider Ali, however, knew the enemies he had to deal with; he quickly bought off the Marathas; and Nizam Ali was soon induced to turn his arms against the very force that had been sent from Madras to his aid. Fortunately the English army of seven thousand men with sixteen guns was commanded by Colonel Smith, a very able soldier. The united forces of the enemy were seventy thousand men. Smith retreated. At Changama, Haider attacked him but was repulsed. Smith continued his retreat until he arrived at Trinomalai. Haider followed and besieged the town. At the same time Tipu, son of Haider Ali, with five thousand horses carried fire and sword to the gates of Fort St. George. The English army of Trinomalai was soon reduced to extremities. Famine might have done its work and given the confederates a victory, but they would not wait its slow operation. Confident in their superior numbers they made an attack. But Smith, by an able movement of his troops, and by the skilful way in which he used his artillery gained a victory which forced Haider to retreat to the hill country.

The Nizam had not expected to be defeated. He had hoped to march to Madras and recover the Carnatic. He now began to fear he might lose what he already possessed. So he, therefore, deserted his new ally Haider Ali as readily as he had deserted the English a few weeks earlier, and made peace with the English, confirming to them the grant of the Northern Circars made two years previously.

Of such stuff were the descendants of Kama-ruddin Asaf Jah made. The Treaty of 1768 followed. This was a tripartite treaty between

the East India Company, the Nizam and the Nawab of the Carnatic.

By this treaty the Nizam revoked all sanads granted to Haider Ali by the Subedars of the Deccan; agreed to cede to the English, in return for an annual payment of seven lakhs of rupees, the Diwani of the Carnatic above the ghats, which had been seized by Haider Ali; pledged himself not to interfere with the possessions of the Nawab of the Carnatic; and agreed to accept a reduced payment for the Northern Circars. The engagement between the English and the Nizam mutually to assist each other with troops was altered. The British Government undertook to furnish the Nizam on his requisition with two battalions of sepoys with guns, subject to the conditions that the Nizam would defray the cost of the force, and that it would not be employed against any person in alliance with the English.

According to the article 9 of the Treaty, the Nizam declared Haider a rebel and usurper, as if he and his family were any better.

“Haider Naique having for some years past usurped the government of the Mysore country, and given great disturbances to his neighbours by attacking and taking from many of them their possessions, and having so lately invaded and laid waste with fire and sword the possession of the English Company and the Nawab Wolau Jah in the Carnatic, it is certainly necessary for their peace and for the general benefit of all the neighbouring powers, that the said Naique should be punished and reduced, so that he may not hereafter have the power to give any person further

trouble ; to this end, the Nawab Ausuph Jah hereby declares and makes known to all the world that he regards the said Naique as a rebel and usurper, and as such divests him of, and revokes from him, all Sunnuds, honours, and distinctions conferred by himself or any other Soubah of the Deccan, because the said Naique has deceived the Nawab Ausuph Jah, broken his agreement, and rendered himself unworthy of all further countenance and favours."

Nazim Ali's record of perfidity was not complete. He again broke faith with the British.

Under the Treaty of 1766, the Circars of Guntur (Murtazanagar) which the Nizam had given in jagir to his brother Basalat Jung, were not to be taken possession of till the latter's death, except in the event of his creating disturbances in the Carnatic. In defiance of the Treaty, however, Guntur district was retained by the Nizam's officers on the death of Basalat Jung in 1782. For nearly six years, in spite of the British protests the Nizam irregularly collected the revenues of the district. Matters became so serious that in 1788 for the first time the British Government deputed a Resident to Hyderabad, the objects of the mission being to demand restitution of the district and to adjust the subsidy due to the Nizam, which had been allowed, in view of the Nizam's conduct to fall into arrears. The matters were finally resolved by the Nizam surrendering the district and engaging to pay the British forthwith the sum of Rs. 9,16,665.

When war was declared between England and France in 1778, it was determined to drive the French

from all their possessions in India. Chandernagore, Masulipatam, Karikal and Pondicherry surrendered without resistance, and there remained to the French only the small station of Mahe on the Malabar coast. Mahe was situated in the territories of the petty Chief who was tributary to Haider Ali, and the British Government resolved to attack it, notwithstanding the threat of Haider Ali to retaliate by an invasion of the Carnatic. The place was taken in 1779. Haider Ali, as well as the Nizam, were further irritated by the arrangements made with Basalat Jang respecting the Guntur Circar. Having collected a large force, Haider burst into the Carnatic in 1780, when the British Government were pressed for money and troops and ill prepared to meet him. Notwithstanding many successes in the campaign which ensued, the British army was so crippled by a defective commissariat that it could effect nothing decisive.

As a means of assisting the military operations by creating a revolution in Haider's territories, the British Resident at Tanjore entered into secret negotiations for the restoration of the Hindu dynasty in Mysore. A Brahman named Trimal Rao, who had for some years resided at Tanjore and had held office in Mysore under the Hindu Government, was supposed to possess political powers from the imprisoned Rani. With him a Treaty was concluded on the 28th October 1782 on the Rani's behalf. Its principal provisions were the restoration of the Hindu family to power, the payment by the Rani of stipulated contribution for the assistance of British troops, the future protection of the country by a British force, and the payment through the British Government of the tribute due from Mysore to the Moghals, and of the Maratha chauth.

Shortly after the conclusion of this agreement Haider Ali died on the 7th December 1782 ; but the war was prosecuted with unabated energy by his son, Tipu Sultan. To further the object of the secret treaty a scheme was formed at Seringapatam for the release of the English prisoners, the seizure of the fort, and the proclamation of the Hindu Raja. But the project was discovered on the night preceding the concerted rising. Every one concerned or suspected of being concerned in it was put to death. The treaty led to no practical results, and there is every reason to believe that the Rani knew nothing of the treaty which had been concluded in her name, or of the conspiracy which had been formed for the overthrow of Tipu's government.

In 1789 Tipu approached the country of Travancore, then in alliance with the British Government, with the object of recovering Karanganur and Ayakotta, which district, being the key to Travancore, the Raja had purchased from the Dutch, but which Tipu alleged to form part of Cochin and to be tributary to him. His attack on the lines of Travancore failed ; and the attack was considered by the British Government as a declaration of war and a violation of the treaty of 1784, in which the Raja of Travancore was included by name. The war which followed was closed in February 1792, when Tipu Sultan threw himself on the mercy of his conquerors and gave his two sons as hostages for the conclusion of the preliminary Treaty. The Treaty was definitely concluded on the 18th March 1792 at Seringapatam. Tipu was by this treaty stripped of half his territories and required to pay three crores and thirty lakhs of rupees, and was bound not to molest the palegars (polygars) and zamindars who had assisted the British forces in the war. The territories taken from Tipu were divided equally between the British

Government, the Nizam and the Peshwa, in pursuance of the triple alliance which had been formed in 1790 to reduce his power.

On 4th July 1790, the Nizam joined the British in an offence alliance against Tipu Sultan. The Peshwa was the third party to the alliance. Under the terms of the treaty the three parties agreed to enter the war and "should their aims be crowned with success in the joint prosecution of it, an equal division shall be made of the acquisition of territory, forts and whatever Circars or government may become possessed of from the time of each party commencing hostilities."

On the termination of the first war against Tipu considerable territories were divided between the British and the Nizam. Territories yielding an income of Rs. 13,16,000 were made over to the Nizam as his share of the conquest although he had taken no very conspicuous part in the campaign.

After the conclusion of peace Lord Cornwallis had transmitted to Hyderabad and Poona proposals to reduce to a definite treaty the mutual guarantee against Tipu which had been stipulated for in the treaty of 1790. But owing to the delay and evasions of the Peshwa, whose designs against Tipu and the Nizam would have been frustrated by the engagements proposed, the conclusion of the treaty was abandoned, although the Nizam had given his verbal consent to it.

At this time the Marathas revived a claim against the Nizam for arrears of chauth, and threatened hostilities if it were not satisfied. The Nizam applied to the British Government for aid, but Sir John Shore who succeeded Lord Cornwallis as Governor-General considered himself precluded by the treaties with the

Marathas from interfering further than as a mediator.

Shore felt he had no choice but to stand strictly by the letter of treaties, by whomsoever made. The Nizam therefore appeared to him as a defaulter who was trying to evade plain obligations. "His record towards the Company had long been one of duplicity," and when he sent a desperate last-minute appeal his own State on merits seemed little entitled to help, as "incorrigibly depraved, devoid of energy consequently liable to sink into vassalage."

Sir John Shore was pledged to the non-intervention policy. The strictness with which he adhered to the condition laid down in Pitt's Bill of forming no alliance without the consent of the Home Board and set both the Marathas and Tipu free to carry out their schemes for their aggrandizement. The Maratha leaders for the last time assembled under the banner of the Peshwa and attacked Nizam Ali. The Nizam again applied to the English for assistance. By the Tripartite Treaty formed against Tipu, each of the allies was bound to protect the others from their enemies. The Nizam and Nana Farnavis had both been parties to this treaty. They were now at war with each other. Whom was Sir John Shore to help? The Marathas would be certain to crush the Nizam and their power would become a great danger to the English. Sir John, however, stuck to his instructions and remained neutral. The result of the war was the total defeat of the Nizam at Kharda and a great extension of Maratha power.

The war which had broken out in 1795 terminated in the convention of Kurdla, by which the Nizam was compelled to cede to the Marathas territories yielding a revenue of thirty-five lakhs of rupees; to pay three crores of rupees; and to give his minister,

Azam-ul-Umara, as a hostage for the fulfilment of these terms. Three-fourths of the territory ceded by the Nizam was afterwards recovered during the dissensions which followed the death of Madho Rao Peshwa.

It was clear, however, that the Nizam could not maintain the integrity or independence of his domains without British support. At first a deputy of the Moghals, now a puppet of the British.

CHAPTER II

“ HIS HIGHNESS THE SUBEDAR ”

The state of affairs in the Nizamate of Hyderabad towards the end of the eighteenth century was contemptible in the words of Warren Hastings, Governor-General. According to Hastings : *

“ The Nawabs of Oudh and the Carnatic, nominally servants of the Emperor, are entirely dependants on the Company. Another nominal officer of the Emperor, the Nizam of Hyderabad, is a star destined to become a satellite but now the object of contention between rival heavenly bodies.

“ His dominions are of small extent and scanty revenue ; his military strength is represented to be most contemptible ; nor was he at any period of his life distinguished for personal courage or the spirit of enterprise. On the contrary, it seems to have been his constant and ruling maxim to foment the incentives of war among his neighbours, to profit by their weakness and embarrassments, but to avoid being a party to himself in any of their contests, and to submit even to humiliating sacrifices rather than subject himself to the chances of war.”

* Selections of State Papers of Governors-General of India, ii.58,

Under the Treaty which was concluded with the Nizam on the 1st September 1798, the subsidiary force at Hyderabad was made permanent and raised to six battalions with guns. The cost Rs. 24,17,000 a year was of course to be borne by the Nizam, the Nizam's French corps was directly disbanded ; and the British Government became the agreed arbitrators between the Nizam and the Peshwa, or, in the event of the Peshwa not consenting to that arrangement, agreeing to protect the Nizam from any unjust and unreasonable demands of the Marathas.

When hostilities broke out between the Marathas and the Nizam in 1795, Tipu Sultan, who had commenced intrigues with the French, assembled his army and threatened to join the Marathas against Hyderabad. In 1798 he sent ambassadors to the Isle of France to raise volunteers for the purpose, publicly avowed and proclaimed, of expelling the British from India. The remonstrances of Lord Wellesley were ineffectual to induce Tipu to come to friendly arrangements, and in February 1799 it became necessary for the armies of the British Government and the Nizam to march against him. The war was terminated on the 4th May by the fall of Seringapatam and the death of Tipu, who fell bravely defending the fort.

In disposing of the conquered territories, it was considered (according to Atkinson) that the partition of them between the British Government and the Nizam would afford just ground of jealousy to the Marathas and aggrandise the power of the Nizam beyond due limits. It was therefore resolved to create a separate government in Mysore and to bestow a portion of the territories on the Marathas although they had taken no part in the war, on condition that the grant should form the basis of a new

treaty with them. The family of Tipu was set aside and the Hindu dynasty was restored in Mysore under Krishna Raj Wadiar, a child of three years of age, the grandson of the ruler deposed by Haidar Ali forty years earlier. The districts on the sea-coast of Mysore, and provinces adjoining the British territories in Malabar and the Carnatic, yielding 7,77,170 pagodas, were reserved by the British Government. The districts of Garamkonda, Guti, and others contiguous to Hyderabad, affording a revenue of 6,07,332 pagodas, were assigned to the Nizam. Provinces yielding 2,63,957 pagodas were offered to, but rejected by, the Peshwa, and were subsequently shared between the British Government and the Nizam. The young Maharaja of Mysore was put in possession of territory producing a yearly revenue of 13,74,076 pagodas.

We next come to an important stage in the relations between the Nizam and the British marked by the Treaty of 1800. The causes underlying the said treaty were as follows :—

Lord Mornington, better known by his subsequent title, the Marquis of Wellesley, had succeeded Sir John Shore. He had been but a short time in India when he saw that the policy of trying to maintain peace by a balance of power, that is, by not allowing any one state in India to become so powerful that it might swallow up another state, must be given up, and that the only security for British interests was to establish the British as Paramount Power in the land. The French influence was at the moment very strong. The Nizam and Sindhia had both of them French armies in their service. Tipu's forces were being drilled by French officers, and Tipu was trying to form an alliance with France to drive the English out of the Peninsula. The Marquis of Wellesley proceeded at once to counteract this French influence and to bring about the fall of Tipu. To this end

- he first formed an alliance with the Nizam, by which the Nizam agreed to receive a subsidiary force of six thousand men with artillery.

This system, which was introduced so largely by the Marquis of Wellesley, may be briefly described. Under it the Indian states surrendered their international life, that is, they could form no alliance, either offensive or defensive, without the consent of the British Power. They could not entertain a Frenchman in their service. They had to maintain a force commanded by British officers, the charges of which were met by assignment of territory to the English. In return the English pledged themselves to defend those states from foreign enemies. Such was the nature of the treaty with the Nizam. The French sepoys at Hyderabad were accordingly disbanded, and a subsidiary force under English officers was stationed there. The Governor-General tried to form a similar treaty with Nana Farnavis and subsequently with Sindhia, but neither of them would listen to his overtures, although they continued on friendly terms with the English. They feared Tipu, but they were not prepared to become feudatories of the English Power. The Nizam had already accepted a portion of subordination to the British Power.

On the outbreak of the fourth Mysore War with Tipu in 1799, the subsidiary force and the Nizam's army had co-operated with the British troops, and after the fall of Seringapatam the Nizam received by the partition treaty of Mysore districts yielding 6,07,332 pagodas. To these were subsequently added two-thirds of the territories which were offered to, but rejected by, the Peshwa. The jealousy with which the Marathas viewed the operations against Tipu, and the threatening attitude which they assumed, led the British Government again to

strengthen their connection with the Nizam, and a new Treaty was concluded with him on the 12th October 1800, by which two battalions of infantry and one regiment of cavalry, with a due proportion of artillery, were added to the subsidiary force, while to secure the payment of the force the Nizam ceded most of the territories which he had acquired by the Treaty of Seringapatam of March 1792 and the Mysore Treaty of 1799, yielding about 18,13,188 pagodas. Certain other lands yielding about Rs. 8,34,718 were also ceded by the Nizam in exchange for the rest of these territories with the territories, with the additional object of securing a well-defined boundary.

The principal clauses of the Treaty of October 12, 1800 provided :

“ For the more distinct explanation of the true intent and effect of the agreement, the Governor-General in Council on behalf of the Honourable Company, hereby declares that the British Government will never permit any power or State whatever to commit with impunity any act of unprovoked hostility or aggressions against the rights or territories of His Highness the Nizam, but will at all times maintain and defend the same, in the same manner as the rights and territories of the Honourable Company are now maintained and defended.

“ With a view to fulfil this Treaty of general defence and protection, His Highness the Nawab Ausuph Jah agrees that two battalions of sepoy and one regiment of cavalry, with a due proportion of guns and artillerymen, shall be added in perpetuity to the

present permanent subsidiary force of six battalions of sepoys, of one thousand firelocks each, and one regiment of cavalry, five hundred strong (with their proportion of guns and artillerymen), so that the whole subsidiary force furnished by the Honourable East India Company to His Highness shall henceforward consist of eight battalions of sepoys (or eight thousand firelocks) and two regiments of cavalry (or one thousand horse), with their requisite complements of guns, European artillerymen, lascars, and pioneers, fully equipped with warlike stores and ammunition, which force is to be stationed in perpetuity in His Highness' territories.

“ For the regular payment of the whole expense of the said augmented subsidiary force (consisting of eight thousand cavalry, and their usual proportion of artillery) His Highness the Nawab Ausuph Jah hereby assigned and ceded to the Honourable East Indian Company in perpetuity all the territories acquired by His Highness, under the Treaty of Seringapatam on the 18th March 1792, and also all the territories acquired by His Highness under the Treaty of Mysore on the 22nd June 1799, according to the Schedule annexed to this Treaty.

“ The territories to be assigned and ceded to the Honourable Company by the fifth Article, or in consequence of the exchange stipulated in the sixth Article, shall be subject to the exclusive management and authority of the said Company and of their officers.

“ As by the present Treaty of general defensive alliance, mutual defence and protection against all enemies are established, His Highness the Nawab Ausuph Jah consequently engages never to commit any act of hostility or aggression against any power whatever ; and in the event of any differences arising whatever adjustment of them in the Company’s Government, weighing matters in the scale of truth and justice, may determine shall meet with full approbation and acquiescence.”

Thus the treaty regulated the duties on which the subsidiary force was to be employed ; secured the Nizam in the sovereignty of his dominions ; prohibited his entering into political negotiations with other States ; and made the British Government the arbiter in his disputes with other powers. In consequence of the equivocal conduct of the Nizam in the first Maratha war, and the refusal of his officers to receive the wounded in battle of Assaye into the forts of Daulatabad and Dharur, an additional article was added on the 9th January 1804 to the treaty of 1800, requiring the contracting parties to admit the troops of either party into their forts when called upon.

By a commercial treaty executed in 1802, the Nizam was allowed the free use of the port of Masulipatam under such regulations as the Governor-General-in-Council might settle.

This treaty provided also for the free transit of articles of commerce between British and Hyderabad territories ; abolished transit duties ; limited import and export duties or customs duties to 5 per cent *ad valorem* to be collected once for all at fixed places.

Nizamali Asaf Jah died in 1803 and was succeeded by his eldest son Sikandar Jah. Sikandar Jah sought and obtained the confirmation of the Emperor at Delhi to his appointment as Nizam, thereby still conceding the sovereignty of Delhi over the territories in his Nizamate, which Kamaruddin Asaf Jah had treacherously repudiated.

On the 7th August 1803, Sikandar Jah confirmed all ex parte engagements with the British Government.

“ All existing Treaties and engagements likewise that were contracted with the late Nawab aforesaid are in full force to all intents and purposes ; and we hereby declare that we are effectually bound by the engagements and Treaties aforesaid, and by the blessing of God, the said Treaties and engagements shall be duly observed until the end of time.”

A like undertaking was given on behalf of the East India Company :

“ And His Excellency the Most Noble the Governor-General-in-Council hereby declares, on the part of the Honourable Company, that the British Government is effectually bound by the said engagements and Treaties, and that the said engagements and Treaties shall be duly observed until the end of time.”

On the death of Madhav Rao, the court at Poona became a complete network of political intrigue ; but in December 1796 Baji Rao was at last seated on the masnad. In 1800 Nana Farnavis died, and with him departed “all the wisdom and moderation

of the Maratha government”. Disorders became everywhere prevalent. Baji Rao was completely under the control of Daulat Rao Sindhia. Jaswant Rao, though an illegitimate son, had succeeded Tukaji Holkar. He united to his fortunes Amir Khan, an Afghan adventurer, invaded Malwa and plundered Ujjain. Sindhia retaliated by advancing against Indore. Jaswant Rao, with a force of thirty thousand men, hurried on to the relief of his capital. But he was thoroughly defeated, and Indore was completely plundered. Had Sindhia followed up his victory, the power of Jaswant Rao might have been annihilated. But he failed to do so and Jaswant Rao, quickly gathering around him an army of daring brigands and freebooters that delighted in plunder, came up with the united forces of the Peshwa and Sindhia near Poona. The battle was one of the most obstinate ever fought in India. Holkar gained a complete victory. The whole of Sindhia’s guns, baggage and stores fell into his hands. Baji Rao fled to Bassein and put himself into the hands of the English.

At Bassein, Baji Rao entered into a treaty with the English. The chief terms were : (1) a subsidiary force was to be permanently stationed in the Peshwa’s territory, and districts yielding twenty-six lakhs of rupees were to be assigned by the Peshwa for its maintenance ; (2) no European of a nation hostile to the English was to be entertained by the Peshwa ; (3) the Peshwa gave up his claims to Surat, and submitted the adjustment of his claims on the Nizam and the Gaekwar to English arbitration ; (4) the Peshwa bound himself to be the faithful ally of the English. The English, on the other hand, promised to protect him and his kingdom.

At the close of the second Maratha War, the

Nizam received by the partition Treaty of 28th April 1804 the Deccan territories conquered from Sindhia and Nagpur, in other words by this arrangement the Nizam received all the territories which belonged to Maharaja Sindhia situated southward of the hills called the Ajanta Hills including the fort and the districts of Jalnapore, and the town and district of Gandapore and all other districts between that range of hills and the river Godavary ceded by the fourth Article of the Treaty of Serjai Anjengaram to the East India Company were to belong in perpetual "Sovereignty of His Highness the Subedar of the Deccan".

This Treaty was the first to recognise the so-called "Sovereignty" of the "Subedar of the Deccan" and to refer to him as "His Highness".

In 1805 the Marquis of Wellesley returned to England. He was a statesman of the highest order. Having none of the narrow ideas of the servants of the Company who regarded their own interests as all-important, he identified British interests with those of India, and instead of stopping to intrigue in attempting to adjust a balance of power among the Indian States, he established the British as the Paramount Power in the land.

The administration of Lord Wellesley is generally considered to mark the time when the British power became paramount in India. But at the time of his retirement it seemed as though all his labours were to be wasted. A new spirit had come over the British nation, and a new policy was to be adopted. The brilliant success of the third Maratha War had dazzled the public in England. Within a very few months the English, by force of arms, had come into possession of the capital of India, and had reduced

the whole of central India to dependence. But this new war with Holkar began to alarm the people at home. A class of politicians arose that condemned the system of annexation and conquest—that condemned the subsidiary system. They advocated “a policy of non-intervention”. The Indian States, they said, ought to be allowed to settle their own quarrels, and the English should not interfere with them. They should have strong military force ever ready to act on the defensive, and no more.

Moreover, Wellesley’s policy, successful though it had been, and the only policy that could have brought peace to the country, was condemned by the Board of Directors in England. The Governor-General, in the face of an Act of Parliament, had engaged in war against prince after prince from Cape Comorin to the Sutlej. He had brought vast territories directly under British rule, and had concluded treaties with such powerful rulers as the Nizam and the Peshwa, by which they maintained subsidiary forces, and acknowledged the English power as their suzerain. The responsibilities thus thrown on the Company were enormous. The expenses of the late wars had emptied their treasury. The new alliances might lead them into further wars and affect their dividends. The Directors became frightened, and requested Lord Cornwallis to proceed to India as Governor-General. Lord Cornwallis was opposed to the policy of Wellesley, and no sooner had he landed at Calcutta than he made known the change of policy that was now to be followed. He set out for the upper provinces to arrange peace with Holkar and Sindhia ; but during the journey his health gave way, and he died at Ghazipur on 5th October 1805.

Sir George Barlow, the Senior Member of Council, assumed the office of Governor-General. He had

steadily assisted and strongly upheld the Marquis of Wellesley in his policy of establishing the British as the paramount power. But now all was changed. As a servant of the Company he felt it to be his duty to obey their instructions to the letter. He quickly concluded peace with Sindhia. Though Lord Lake had Holkar in his power and was on the point of utterly crushing him, a treaty was also concluded with him, by which Holkar's territories were restored to him. Nor was this all. The Rajput states had done great service to the English during the Maratha wars, and the English had promised to protect them from their enemies. Sir George Barlow, notwithstanding the protest of Lord Lake, broke faith with the Rajputs, annulled the treaties and handed the Rajputs over to be ravished and plundered by Holkar's brigands. Lord Lake, thereupon, resigned in disgust and sailed for England. The Court of Directors wanted Sir George Barlow to go still further, to annul the treaty of Bassein and the treaty with the Nizam ; but he refused.

The Nizam also received considerable accession to his domains by the Treaty of the 12th December 1822 as a reward for his assistance in the Pindari and Maratha Wars of 1817. In particular the Nizam received by transfer the following districts belonging to the Peshwas :

| | | |
|-----------------------|----------|----|
| Oomurtehair | | |
| Julgaum | | |
| Wyezapoor Seorage .. | | |
| Untoor Seorage .. | | |
| 22 Villages of Talook | | |
| Rahisbone Seornije. | | |
| Dhabny Seorage .. | | |
| Detached Villages .. | | |
| Shewlee Peer | | |
| | Total | |
| | Rs. | a. |
| | 5,69,275 | 8 |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|
| Hirpoor Talokah | .. | |
| Ghal Nandoor .. | ... | |
| Sundry Villages | .. | |

and the following districts belonging to the Raja of Nagpur :

| | | | | | | |
|------------|----|----|--|----------|----|----|
| Akoal .. | .. | .. | | Rs. | a. | p. |
| Argaum.. | .. | .. | | 3,25,000 | 8 | 0 |
| Wumais.. | .. | .. | | | | |
| Bhatooly | .. | .. | | | | |
| Kulkall .. | .. | .. | | | | |

On the other hand, by the same treaty, the Nizam agreed to transfer to the Company partly by exchange and partly to secure a well-defined frontier the pargannas of Mohul, Pandia, Wanges, Mundcoop, Tainbhorne, Chumaigoonda, Kunyee Wullect, Burdole, Oomergaum and the Circar of Purainde as also the whole of the District of Ahmednagar. The Nizam was released from all arrears of tribute which he owed to the Peshwa ; and from all demands for such tribute in the future.

Sikandar Jah died in 1829, and was succeeded by Nasir-ud-Daula, with whom a Treaty was concluded in 1831, confirming all existing treaties. During the latter years of Sikandar Jah's rule the administration of the country fell into great disorder. The revenues of the State were farmed to contractors, who were practically supreme in their several districts. In consequence the grossest oppression prevailed, and the disciplined force under British officers was repeatedly called out to repress local rebellion. The country was infested with robber bands, and the roads were unsafe, except for persons travelling with large armed escorts. For the restoration of order it became

necessary to employ British officers in the different districts. They settled the amount of revenue to be levied, and under their administration the country soon improved. The State, moreover, was deeply involved in debt both to merchants and to the British Government. The annual payments to the Nizam for the northern Circars were accordingly capitalised for a sum of Rs. 1,66,66,666, by which the Nizam's government was temporarily extricated from its difficulties.

On the succession of Nasir-ud-Daula, and at his request, the direct interference of British officers in the administration was discontinued, and he was assured that, provided the revenue settlements made by the British Officers were maintained for the full period of their currency, the British Government would withdraw from all interference, and the Nizam would be absolute both in the selection and removal of his minister, and in all other matters of internal administration. The withdrawal of interference was immediately followed by the return of disorder and misrule. Every department of the government became disorganised, and the credit of the State was so bad that bankers refused to grant loans. The Nizam's Chief Minister, Chandu Lal, finding himself unable to cope with the financial embarrassments, resigned his office on the 6th September 1843. His long and distinguished services to the Hyderabad State were highly praised by Lord Ellenborough.

For some months the Nizam endeavoured to carry on the administration by himself; but at length with the approval of the British Government, he appointed as his minister Siraj-ul-Mulk, son of the former minister, Munir-ul-Mulk. In the meantime however the pay of the contingent had fallen greatly into arrears and advances had to be made from the British

treasury. By the 12th Article of the treaty of 1800 the Nizam had agreed in time of war to furnish 6,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry to co-operate with the British army, and to use every effort in bringing the whole force of his dominion into the field as speedily as possible. The Nizam's troops had proved very inefficient in the first Maratha War, and after the conclusion of the campaign various schemes were from time to time proposed for their reform, but with little success. At length in 1813 one of the corps of Hyderabad mutinied, and in its place Chandu Lal raised two battalions, which were armed, clothed and equipped like the Company's troops.

It soon became necessary to make advances from the British treasury for the payment of this contingent force of reformed troops ; and in 1843 the Nizam was distinctly informed that, in the event of application for further advances, a territorial security for the payment of the debt would be demanded. No efforts, however, were made to pay off the debts on account of the contingent either by Siraj-ul-Mulk or by his successors in office, Amjad-ul-Mulk and Shams-ul-Umara, who were appointed in 1848 and 1849 respectively, with the approval of the British Government. In 1849, a requisition was made for the payment of the debt by the 31st December 1850. No steps were taken for payment, and in 1851 a territorial cession was demanded to liquidate the debt, which then amounted to upwards of Rs. 78,00,000. A payment of Rs. 40,00,000 was at once made, and the appropriation of the revenues of certain districts was promised to meet the remainder. The demand for a territorial cession was therefore withdrawn, but no real improvement followed,

CHAPTER III

“ FAITHFUL ALLY ”

It was not until 1853 that another Treaty was concluded with the Nizam, and Berar was ceded on Terms to the Company. In view of the present controversy over Berar, it is well to know the reasons.

Lord Dalhousie's Government is remarkable for the use made of the political principle so named which was that if a ruler of a dependent state had no natural heir his state lapsed to the paramount power, unless he had adopted a son with the permission of that power. The enforcement of this doctrine was a distinct change of policy, because whereas the older school of politicians in India had avoided annexations, Lord Dalhousie welcomed every possible opportunity for them. His motives were very good. He believed that the people would be better governed and more prosperous under British rule, but this motive was misunderstood and great discontent was created by his policy, which discontent had very serious influence on future events. Eight Indian States were annexed under this doctrine of which the largest was Nagpur, the Raja of which had died without an heir and had not adopted a son. Others were Satara and Sambalpur.

At Hyderabad too Lord Dalhousie had to interfere. The British Government had advanced large sums of money to meet the expenses of the Nizam's contingent, and the Nizam had delayed to liquidate the debt. Lord Dalhousie therefore compelled the

Nizam to cede the Province of Berar, which had been given to Hyderabad on the overthrow of the Raja of Nagpur in 1803. Since then Berar has been under the administration of the Government of India. All surplus revenue from the Berars used to be handed over to the Nizam's treasury till the days of Lord Curzon, when the share of the Nizam's Government was commuted into a fixed sum to be paid annually.

The reason for the Treaty of 1853 was stated in the preamble to be :

“ Whereas in the lapse of time many changes in the condition of Princes and neighbouring States have taken place by reason of which it has now become expedient to revise the military arrangements that were formerly agreed upon for the fulfilment of the said Treaties ; and whereas differences and discussions have for some time existed between the contracting parties regarding the adjustment of charges connected with portions of the military arrangements subsisting between the States ; and whereas it is fit and proper, and for the mutual advantage of both powers, that such differences should now be finally settled, and that the recurrence of such discussions, which tend to disturb the friendship and harmony of the contracting parties, should effectually be prevented.”

After confirming all former Treaties and agreements between the two Governments then in force, the British Government agreed under the terms of the Treaty to maintain, in addition to the subsidiary

forces, an auxiliary force, called the Hyderabad Contingent, of not less than 5,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 4 field batteries of artillery. In order to provide for the payment of this force and for certain pensions and the interest on the debt, the Nizam assigned in trust districts in Berar, Dharseo and the Raichur Doab, which were estimated to yield a gross revenue of 50 lakhs of rupees. It was also agreed that accounts should be annually rendered to the Nizam, and that any surplus revenue which might accrue should be paid to him. By this Treaty the services of the subsidiary force and the contingent were to be at the disposal of the British Government in time of war, and the Nizam was relieved of any further obligation in this respect. The contingent ceased to be part of the Nizam's army, and became an auxiliary force kept up by the British Government for the Nizam's use.

Nizam Nair-ud-Daula died in 1858 and was succeeded, with the approval of the British, by his son Afzal-ud-Daula.

The mutiny of 1857 might have spread to Hyderabad and affected British residents if it had not been nipped in the bud by Salar Jung, the Nizam's Minister, who was friendly to the British.

The mutiny forced English statesmen and the whole English nation to consider the needs and circumstances of India as they had never done before. It was clear that misgovernment had much to do with bringing it about, and the question was, could such misgovernment be avoided in the future? Two bills were brought into the House of Commons, the first by Lord Palmerson, a Whig, and the second by Benjamin Disraeli, a Tory, to reorganize the Government of India but neither was approved, and finally

the two great parties united to decide on the principles of the new Government of India Bill. One thing was easily decided. The dual government of the Crown and the Board of Control, and the East India Company through its Directors, must come to an end. The Company had ceased to trade and in all political matters was guided by the Board of Control ; its further existence was worse than useless because it made the administration cumbrous and slow. It was therefore decided to transfer the whole Government of India to the Crown, which would exercise its powers through a Secretary of State. The next point was the constitution of a council to advise the Secretary of State. It was decided that this should consist of fifteen members nominated by the Crown, of whom eight must have served for ten years in India. An Act of Parliament thus bringing India under the Crown was passed on 2nd August 1858. Indian revenues were not to be spent on war outside India without the permission of the Parliament. Orders for the commencement of any war in India were to be communicated to Parliament without delay.

On 1st November 1858 the Proclamation of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria was publicly read at all the principal stations in India, and was translated into all the vernacular languages. It has been called the Magna Charta of India. It proclaimed the transfer of the Government of India from the Company to the Crown. It made known that the British Government had no desire or intention of interfering in any way with the religion or caste of the subjects. It confirmed all existing treaties, rights and usages, and proclaimed a free pardon to all rebels except such as had been implicated in the murder of the British. It re-affirmed the principle of the Act of 1833 that no Indian was de-

barred by reason of his race or religion from occupying any public office. It concluded with these words : "It is Our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement and to administer the Government for the benefit of all Our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be Our strength : in their contentment Our security ; and in their gratitude Our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to Us and to those in authority under Us, strength to carry out these Our wishes for the good of Our people."

The Queen's Proclamation guaranteed the rights of the Indian Princes of India, and to place their position as nobles of the Empire beyond all doubt. Each was granted a sanad or patent of nobility in which the right of adoption was recognized. In this way the doctrine of lapse was entirely given up. One hundred and fifty-three Princes received this sanad and gladly welcomed the change which brought them into direct relationship with the British Crown. The issue of these sanads was Lord Canning's last official act.

Afzal-ud-Daula was Nizam for twelve years. He died on the 26th February 1869. This period had been notable for considerable extension of British influence in Hyderabad. The so-called internal sovereignty of the state was at the best at all times only nominal.

Owing to a disagreement the Nizam resolved in 1861 to remove Salar Jang from office, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the Resident. But the British Government refused to countenance the measure, and Salar Jang was maintained in office. Differences again arose between the Nizam and his

minister in 1867, but were eventually arranged, and Salar Jang continued to hold the office of which he had felt compelled to tender his resignation. The opportunity was taken to impress upon the Nizam the advisability of giving his entire confidence to a minister who had ruled the State with so much ability, and to point out the serious consequences which a relapse into misrule would entail on the Hyderabad State. This was a polite reminder to the Nizam that he held his fiat at the sufferance of the British Government.

Several engagements between the Government of Hyderabad and the British Government were concluded between the years 1860 and 1869.

As a reward for the Nizam's good behaviour during the Mutiny, a debt of Rs. 50 lakhs due by the Nizam was called off by the Treaty of 1860. The district of Shorapur was ceded to the Nizam by the same agreement.

In August 1860 the Nizam agreed to cede the land requisite for railway purposes in the Raichur Doab.

In 1861, the Nizam issued a Sanad empowering the Resident to enquire into and punish offences committed by Europeans and the descendants of Europeans in the Hyderabad territory.

In 1867 the Nizam of Hyderabad State was granted a permanent salute of 21 guns.

In 1862 the Nizam, like other rulers, received from Lord Canning on behalf of the Queen, a Sanad guaranteeing that any succession to his State, which might be in accordance with the customs of his

family (and with Muhammadan Law) would be recognised.

An Extradition treaty for offences such as murder, treason and the like was entered into between the British Government and the Nizam in 1867.

Salar Jung now tried hard to recover the Assigned Districts in Berar but unsuccessfully.

Applications for the restoration of the Hyderabad Assigned Districts were made on more than one occasion, but for a long time the British Government declined to make any essential alteration in the arrangements provided for by the treaties of 1853 and 1860. Under the British administration, the revenue of Berar greatly increased ; and a large surplus was paid over to the Hyderabad State under the treaty provisions up to the time of their revision in 1902.

The Nizam Afzal-ud-Daula died after a short illness on the 26th February 1869 and was succeeded by his only son, Mir Mahbub Ali Khan, then not three years of age, who was placed on the masnad by the British Resident, and the joint administration of affairs during the young Nizam's minority was entrusted to Sir Salar Jung and Nawab Shams-ul-Umara. The education of the young Nizam was an object of solicitude to the British Government, and a guarantee was obtained from the ministers that when the proper time arrived an English gentleman should be entrusted with the duty of superintending it. In 1874 Captain John Clerk was appointed for the purpose, and he continued in the post until the year 1876, when he was succeeded by his brother, Captain Claude Clerk, whose employment came to an end in June 1887.

In 1870 an agreement was concluded between the British Government and the Nizam, providing for the construction of a railway to connect Hyderabad with the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. The main points of the agreement were that the Hyderabad State, with the aid of shareholders, should provide for the capital necessary for the constructions, maintenance and working of the railway, including provision of land, payment of compensation, and cost of services ; and that the British Government should construct and manage the railway on behalf of the Nizam, who should receive all profits derived from the working.

In 1871 an exchange of villages was negotiated with a view to the rectification of that portion of the border between the Assigned Districts in Berar and the territories administered directly by the Nizam's Government. It was understood that this arrangement in no way affected the conditions under which the Assigned Districts held by the British Government, and that in the transferred villages all concessions granted by the British Government during its administration of them would be maintained.

By the treaty of the 2nd December 1871 Scindia ceded to the British Government his rights and interests of every description in certain ancestral villages which he possessed within the territories of the Nizam. As it was desirable to transfer the rights and interests which the British Government had thus acquired in these villages to the Hyderabad State, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed on the 13th August 1872, by which the villages in question were ceded to the Nizam, who in return ceded to the British Government in full sovereignty certain villages in the Bombay Presidency.

In 1875, the Nizam's Government undertook to prohibit the export of Hyderabad produced salt into British territory.

A Postal Agreement was executed by the Nizam's Government in August 1882, making provision for the interchange under certain conditions, of mails between the British and the Nizam's post offices.

On the 5th February 1884 Mir Mahbub Ali Khan came of age, and was invested with full powers of administration by the Viceroy, the Marquis of Ripon. With the concurrence of the Government of India, he appointed Salar Jang II to be Minister.

A proposal that the Nizam should visit England in the year 1883 fell through, owing to the death of Sir Salar Jang on the 8th February 1883. During the year that had still to elapse before Mir Mahbub Ali Khan came of age, the administration was entrusted to the Peshkar, Maharaja Narindar Parshad, and Mir Laik Ali, the elder son of Sir Salar Jang, who were entitled respectively Senior and Junior Administrators. There was also a Council of Regency composed of the Peshkar and the Nawabs Khurshid Jah and Bashir-ud-Daula. The Nizam presided over the Council, and Mir Laik Ali, who assumed his father's title of Salar Jang, acted as its Secretary, but they had no votes.

Salar Jang II resigned in April 1887, and in July the Nizam, with the concurrence of the Government of India, appointed Nawab Bashir-ud-Daula as Minister. During the interval between April and July 1887 the business of the State was conducted by the Nizam himself with the help of Colonel C. H. T. Marshall, of the Punjab Commission.

Between 1886 and 1924, mining rights and prospecting licences were granted to several British Companies by the Nizam with the approval of the Government of India.

In March, 1924, the Government of India ruled that, as the main features of their policy in regard to the grant of mining concessions in Indian States had been incorporated in the rules for the grant of prospecting licences and mining leases in the Hyderabad State, and as the revised rules which the Nizam's Government proposed to issue would accord with the principles which had been approved by the Government of India, there was no need for His Exalted Highness' Government to make a reference to them before granting prospecting licences and mining leases to their subjects, or to British Indian subjects of high standing and good repute. This applied also to the transfer of licences and leases to such persons.

On the 8th October 1904, the Nizam's Government delegated to the Government of India full criminal and police jurisdiction including sanitary jurisdiction in the following eleven jagirs and other villages within Secunderabad Cantonment limits, *viz.*, Pedda Tokatta, Chinna Tokatta, Sirarampur, Kakaguda, Maredpalli, Chakliguda, Tawarpura, Sikh Village, Balamraj, Rasulpur and Trimulgherry village. Later on the 14th September 1905, the Nizam's Government delegated similar jurisdiction to the Government of India in respect of two other villages, *viz.*, Basareddiguda and Lalapet.

In June 1902 the Government of India gave their consent to an arrangement made between the Bombay and Hyderabad Governments for the equal division of the net yearly income received from the ferry across

the Godavari river, near the villages of Kaigaon in the Aurangabad district.

The question of Berar which had been the subject of much correspondence between the Government of India and the Nizam was finalised by an agreement executed by the Nizam Government on the 5th November 1902, whereby the Hyderabad Assigned Districts were leased to the British Government in perpetuity in consideration of a fixed and perpetual rental of Rs. 25 lakhs per year, the Nizam's Sovereignty being recognised by hoisting his flag and firing a salute annually on his birthday. It is as well to set out on the terms of the agreement as the matter is still of importance from the Hyderabad point of view and far from finally settled :

“Whereas by the Treaties concluded between the British Government and the Hyderabad State on the 21st May 1853 and the 26th December 1860, the Berar Districts were assigned to the British Government for the maintenance of the Hyderabad Contingent, the surplus, if any, from the Assigned Districts being paid to His Highness the Nizam.

“And whereas the British Government and His Highness the Nizam desire to improve this arrangement.

“And whereas it is inexpedient in the interests of economy that the Assigned Districts should continue to be managed as a separate administration or the Hyderabad Contingent as a separate force.

“And whereas it is also desirable that His

Highness the Nizam should receive a fixed instead of a fluctuating and uncertain income from the Assigned Districts.

“ The following terms are hereby agreed upon between the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council and the Nawab Mir Sir Mahbub Ali Khan Bahadur Fateh Jung, Nizam of Hyderabad :

- (i) His Highness the Nizam, whose sovereignty over the Assigned Districts is re-affirmed, leases them to the British Government in perpetuity in consideration of the payment to him by the British Government of a fixed and perpetual rent of 25 lakhs of rupees per annum ;
- (ii) The British Government, while retaining the full and exclusive jurisdiction and authority in the Assigned Districts which they enjoy under the Treaties of 1853 and 1860, shall be at liberty, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in those Treaties, to administer the Assigned Districts in such manner as they may deem desirable, and also to redistribute, reduce, reorganise and control the forces now composing the Hyderabad Contingent, as they may think fit, due provision being made as stipulated by Article 3 of the Treaty of 1853 for the protection of His Highness' Dominions.”

In 1899, Mir Mahbub Ali Khan fixed his civil list at fifty lakhs of H. S. Rupees per annum.

Mir Mahbub Ali Khan died on the 29th August

1911 and was succeeded by his eldest son Mir Usman Ali Khan, born on the 6th April 1886. Mir Mahbub Ali Khan left two other sons by different mothers, *viz.*, Mir Ahmad Mohi-ud-din Ali Khan (Salabat Jah) and Mir Muhammad Mohid-ud-din Ali Khan (Basalat Jah), both born in 1907.

Maharaja Sir Kishen Pershad resigned his appointment as Minister on the 11th July 1912, and was succeeded by Nawab Salar Jang Bahadur, who in turn vacated the post in November 1914. From that time Mir Usman Ali Khan acted as his own Minister till the 21st November 1919, when he inaugurated an Executive Council of 8 members with Sir Sayyed Ali Imam as President. He resigned in September 1922, and Nawab Sir Fariddoon Mulk Bahadur was appointed to officiate, but was relieved, owing to ill-health, in April 1924. He was succeeded by Nawab Wali-ud-Daula who held office until November 1925, when he was succeeded by Maharaja Peshkar Sir Pershad Bahadur.

In 1912, the Nizam, along with other Princes went to Delhi, knelt before the King and swore allegiance.

In the first World War, the Nizam's Government contributed Rs. 1,53,00,000 towards the maintenance on active service from September 1914, to December 1918 of one regiment of the Hyderabad Imperial Service Lancers and the 20th Deccan Horse (now styled the 9th Royal Deccan Horse), an old Hyderabad Contingent regiment. The State also subscribed Rs. 1,64,00,000 to the War Loans, and gave valuable assistance to the Government of India during the war. The Nizam subscribed Rs. 6,39,000 to various relief funds, in addition to a donation to His Majesty's Government and to objects in

England connected with the war amounting to £225,800.

On the 1st January 1918 the Nizam was granted the special title of His Exalted Highness as a hereditary distinction ; and, in a letter dated the 24th January 1918, the King-Emperor was pleased to confirm to him formally in the honourable title of “ Faithful Ally ” of the British Government.

From the foregoing narrative of Hyderabad history, it will be seen that the title of “ Faithful Ally ” was scarcely deserved. In two centuries of chequered history, the Asaf Jahs had established a unique record in duplicity, usurpation and bad faith.

The King-Emperor, at the beginning of 1918, with the clouds of war black on the European horizon with few friends and many enemies, turned to a crafty miser in the hope no doubt that a pretty title and a charming letter would induce him to open the purse strings of his wallet.

The King-Emperor forgot that his “ Faithful Ally ” was only “ Faithful ” and an “ally” so long as Hyderabad was within the range of Secunderabad muskets,

CHAPTER IV

HYDERABAD

Before the two Dominions of India and Pakistan were born, India comprised an area of over 1,808,000 square miles with a population of about 390 millions—nearly one-fifth of the human race.

But of this total a very large part was not under the direct administration of the Government of India, but in varying measure, under its control, supervision and protection. The total area covered by the Indian States was about 715,000 square miles, with a population of over 93 millions.

The Indian States embraced the widest variety of country and jurisdiction. In size they varied from petty principalities like Lawa in Rajputana with an area less than 19 square miles, the Simla Hill States, which were little more than small holdings to states like Kashmir, Gwalior, Baroda and largest of all Hyderabad, with an area as big as Italy and a population running to fourteen millions and more.

They included the inhospitable regions of Western Rajputana, Baroda part of the Garden of India, Mysore in agricultural and mineral wealth and Kashmir, where the sunset turned to flame and the emerald lies snugly hedged with diamonds.

In the Indian States, as the Butler Commission found, nature assumed its grandest and its simplest forms. The eternal snows of the Himalayas gathered up and enshrined the mystery of the East and its

ancient lore. The enterprise of old world western adventure slumbered by the placid lagoons of Travancore and Cochin.

The parched plains of Rajputana and Central India with their hilly fastnesses recalled the romance and chivalry of days that still lived and inspired great thoughts and deeds. The hills and plains of Hyderabad and Mysore, famed for gems and gold, for rivers, forests, water-falls still cried out great names of history. Over the dry rab plateau of the Deccan swept the marauding hosts of the Mahrattas, eating here and drinking there, right up to ancient Delhi. From the West, the ports of Kathiawar with their busy progressive people stretch out hands to the jungles of Manipur in the East with their primitive folk and strange practices. (Butler Committee Report, para. 12.)

Historically the main common feature that distinguished the States from the Provinces was that the States unlike the Provinces had not been annexed by the British Power. In their individual origin, however, the evolution and growth of States represented different processes. Firstly, there were the old established States, such as those in Rajputana, which were in existence before the main waves of foreign invasion took place. Another class consisted mainly of the States with Muslim dynasties which were founded by the nobles or the Viceroys of the invading foreign Emperors. Thirdly, there were the States like Hyderabad, Mysore which emerged in the period of the decline of the Moghal power and prior to the final stages of the consolidation of the British territory. Then there were the newer States, which the British recognised during the final period of consolidation. Only one State, namely, Benares, was set up and recognised

since the assumption of the Government of India by the Crown.

Geographically the States were scattered over every portion of the map of India. The yellow and pink map of pre-Partition India showed the Baluchistan States and the States of Kashmir and Sikkim (the last one sometimes shown in pale green to indicate that unlike other States it was under the External Affairs Department) on the frontiers of India. It showed in the north-east Cooch-Behar enclosed within the territories of the Bengal Province and the Manipur State surrounded by the territories of the Province of Assam. Southwards in the eastern portion of India the next block of Indian State territory was to be found in a chain of small States, which were known as the Chhattisgarh and Orissa States. Further south figured the States of Hyderabad and Mysore, the latter a unit larger than the Irish Free State and having twice its population. Facing the Indian Ocean further southwards still were the two densely populated State of Cochin and Travancore. Northwards up the west coast, and both on the coast and inland, were to be found various States mainly of the Mahratta period, the largest of these being Kolhapur. The chain of States ended with the State of Baroda made up of several separate areas to the north of Bombay Presidency. Further to the north-west lay the extremely numerous assemblage of States and Estates included in the Western India States Agency, of which the better known were Kutch, Nawanagar, Bhavnagar and Junagadh. To the north-east of Bombay, separating Bombay and the Central Provinces from the United Provinces, lay the main mass of Central India States which included Gwalior, Indore and Rewa. The northern and north-western portion of Bombay was divided from the Punjab by the wide

strip of Rajputana States. Among the States of this group, which constituted the largest unit of the Indian States, were the important Rajputana States of Bikaner, Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur. In the United Provinces were to be found the isolated States of Tehri-Garhwal, Rampur and Benares. To the north-west were the Punjab States including Patiala stretching up to Simla ; and the States of Jind, Nabha and Kapurthala ; and a number of smaller States. Further west appeared the States of Bahawalpur. The State of Khairpur lay in the geographical orbit of Sind.

The internal administration of the States and their political set-up varied greatly. There was a very wide difference in the degree of administrative efficiency reached by the most advanced and the most backward. According to the information circulated by the Chamber of Princes in 1946, over 60 States had set up some form of legislative bodies. In several others, schemes for associating people with the governance of their States were under consideration. In most of the cases, the development of representative institutions did not approximate to the growth of self-governing institutions in the Provinces, which were on the threshold of complete freedom. However, everywhere there was a growing consciousness of the rights and liberties of the people and a new spirit was abroad.

British India was divided into provinces with Provincial Governments of their own, slowly becoming more and more autonomous, with a Central Government ultimately responsible to the British Parliament, forming in all one political unit. But the Indian States, 562 in number, did not form a single political unit. They were separate political entities. Each was separately administered and had no connection

with the administration of other States. Their mutual relations were not regulated by them but by the Paramount Power. And it was only comparatively recently that the Indian Princes gained the right of meeting together to discuss matters of common concern and to take concerted action for the redress of common grievances. In fact there was nothing common between them except that they were all autocratically governed and few in the interest of their subjects. It was, therefore, wrong to speak of them as Indian India, or as if they formed a single unit comparable in any way to British India.

What was called Indian India was therefore not one political unit but a conglomeration of States, large and small, as heterogeneous a collection that one would think of.

If the Hyderabad State was the most important from the standpoint of size and revenue the Mysore State had the enviable reputation of being the best administered of the Indian States. In the opinion of Miss Yvonne Fitzroy, who was for many years closely connected with the Viceregal Court, the Maharaja is "the only Prince who has granted a genuine constitution to his people, and his rule is extraordinarily enlightened and progressive." (Court and Camps in India).

The Rajputana Agency consisted of several Sub-Agencies and watched the interest of the Paramount Power in twenty-one States. Among those under the surveyance of this Agency, the most important were, Bikaner, ruled for many years by Maharaja with the golden tongue, Udaipur, Jodhpur and Jaipur. There was Alwar, whose services were recruited from photographs (not to be returned); there

was Bharatpur, one of whose rulers was notorious for the bill he left unpaid, there was Lawa with only 19 square miles of territory and a population of only 2,000 persons.

“Gratitude-honour-fidelity,” these have been described as the foundations of Rajput character. “Ask a Rajput” says Tod in his famous chronicle, “which is the greatest of crimes?” He will reply, “Forgetfulness of favours”. Add to this a high and reckless courage, a jealous sense of honour, extreme pride of race, chivalrous consideration for women—the women of the race were worthy of their lords, there could be no higher praise—a passionate love of faith and freedom, and you have some, at least, of the material that has gone to the making of their incomparable story.

In the Central India Agency, Indore was the most important State. It had the conspicuous record of having had three successive rulers deposed—the latest over the notorious Mumtaz Begum.

Bhopal ranked next in importance to Hyderabad among the Mohammedan States of India. The ruler graduated in arts, which was among the most creditable of his performances. He has been one of the world’s greatest polo players and devoted himself to the game for four months in the year. His State was unfortunately for him, like that of the Nizam, geographically in India. His heart was in Pakistan.

The Government of India was represented directly to the most important States. Those less important are represented through various Agencies. As to the power exercised by Residents and Agents, we shall have more to say later, but generally the Agencies kept their hands off the workings of the internal ma-

chinery. In matters in which the Paramount Power was interested, the "whisper of the Residency was the thunder of the State".

Of all the States the most important from the viewpoint of size, population and revenue were the Nizam's "Dominions". The revenues of the Hyderabad State for many years were double that of any other State and equivalent to about 16½ crores in Government of India currency. The State could boast of a size equal to Italy or France and has a population of about 16 millions. The State had several generations of able administrators, while in general, development of the State was nothing comparable to Mysore or Travancore, it was not on the whole unsatisfactorily administered.

Since 1911, the Ruler of Hyderabad has been (to give him all his titles) HIS EXALTED HIGHNESS RUSTAM-I-DAURAN, ARSHATU-I-ZAMAN, LT. GENERAL MUZAFFAR-UL-MULK, W-AL-MAMALIK, KHAN MIR SIR OSMAN ALI KHAN BAHADUR, FATEH JUNG, SIPAH SALAR, Faithful Ally of the British Government, NIZAM-UD-DAULA, NIZAM-UL-MULK, ASAF JAH, G.C.S.I., G.B.E., NIZAM OF HYDERABAD AND BERAR.

Most of the above titles are self-conferred, such as "Rustam-i-Dauran" or "Rustam (strong man) of the Times," "Arshatu-i-Zaman ("Socrates of the Age"); "Muzaffar-ul-Mulk" (Conqueror of the Country), "Wal Mamalik" ("and of the Kingdom"). None of these titles has any reference to the actual achievements of His Exalted Highness.

Mir Osman Ali Khan, for that is what he really is, shorn of all the labels printed in London and

Hyderabad, was born in 1886, and succeeded his Father Mahabat Ali Khan in 1911. As his eldest son he was recognised by the British as the future Nizam. Osman Ali's education was under British Tutors.

In 1906, Osman Ali married Dulhan Pasha, his first official wife. The heir apparent, Azam Jah (Mir Himat Ali Khan) was born on 21st February 1907 and Muazzam Jah (Shujaat Ali Khan) was born on 21st December 1907 are sons by Dulhan Pasha. The Nizam has numberless other sons and daughters by several of his wives and concubines. His harem has been one of the largest in history. When he ascended the throne, he sold his father's women for thirty rupees apiece. When Osman Ali Khan tires of a woman, he passes her on to one of his nobles for valuable consideration, two, three or even a hundred gold pieces, according to her worth in his eyes.

By selling his wives, by insisting on large Nazaranas from his officials on the slightest pretext and from all interview seekers (save British and American); by misappropriating property, jewellery, and monies of rich minors in Court of Ward; by passing on court expenses to the State Exchequer and saving his own cash appropriations, and the revenue from vast private estates, Mir Osman Ali has amassed for himself a colossal fortune. For years he has been known as the world's richest man. His riches have been variously computed to be in the neighbourhood of 600 to 1000 crores.

Mir Osman Ali Khan is a man of frugal habits in diet and dress but has abounding ambition. For years he has seen in his wealth the means of securing the leadership of the Islamic world.

He has envied the Aga Khan, his international fame and his high standing in the Courts of Europe. But out of fear that Hyderabad history might repeat itself, he had never ventured out of his "dominions" for more than a few days at a time, on very rare and special occasions. He has Palaces in Delhi, Bombay and Poona, but for the most part they remain empty symbols of his wealth.

In the fall of the Caliphate, Osman Ali saw an opportunity for advancing his claims to leadership of the world of Islam. The first step was recognition by the British Government. In 1925, he accordingly wrote for recognition as an independent sovereign and for the return of the Ceded Districts. He cited the recognition by the King-Emperor of his status as "Faithful Ally" of the British Government. But Lord Reading in a letter to the Nizam (26th March 1927) repudiated in now famous terms all his pretensions to negotiate with the British Government on equal terms (see Chapter V).

In spite, therefore, of two hundred years of history, the Nizam was still little better than an Imperial puppet. It is well of course to mention that were it not for British bayonets during the nineteenth century there would have been a score of claimants for the Nizamate.

But Osman Ali Khan was never altogether without hope. He married Azam Jah, his eldest son, to Durre-Shavar, only daughter of Ex-Caliph Abdul Majid II of Turkey. Muazzam Jah married Nilophar, a cousin of Durre-Shavar. Turks, Arabs tired of the Caliphate had relegated it to oblivion. To the Nizam it meant a status. The Nizam therefore set out to buy it. If he could not be the Caliph, perhaps his grandson could with the royal blood of Turkey in his

veins. But the British, never enthusiastic about a Caliph in India, did not encourage the idea. And so much as Mir Osman Ali had ambitions, he could not ignore the fact that the British Residency was only a very very short distance away.

To furnish some evidence of his enlightenment as a ruler, Mir Osman Ali Khan has encouraged the development measure of popular institutions—which do not, however, encroach too seriously upon the exercise of his powers. And so there is a Legislative Council consisting of about 20 members of whom, besides the President and the Vice-President, eleven are officials. There are seven non-official members of whom one each is nominated by the Sarf-i-Khas Mubarak and the Paigah Jagirs, two each are elected by the Bar and the Jagirdars and one is nominated by the Government to represent the interests of the General Public. Two extraordinary members are also nominated by the Government, the nomination being based on consideration of special knowledge of the subject of legislation. The Council assists in considering bills and recommending them for sanction by the Ruler.

The administration is carried on by a system of Departments run on lines not unsimilar to those followed in India.

By the 1936 Berar Agreement, the sovereignty of the Nizam over Berar was re-affirmed, the Berar rent was to continue as before to be paid by the British Government to the Nizam, but the administration of Berar was to continue as before as part of the Central Provinces.

The State (apart from Berar) is divided into two divisions, Telingana and Mahratwara, seventeen districts and 153 taluqas. Local boards are consti-

tuted in each district and taluqa. The State maintains its own currency which consists of gold and silver coins and a large note issue. The rupee, known as the Osmania Sicca, exchanges with the British Indian rupee at an average ratio of 116-10-8 to 100. There is a State postal service and stamps for internal purposes.

Apart from the personal fortunes of the Nizam the Hyderabad State as such is by far the wealthiest of the Indian States, having a revenue in its own currency of about 16½ crores, which was approximately double that of the Central Provinces and Berar, and more than double that of any other of the larger States. Its finances have been in a prosperous condition and to a total Reserve of more than 29.47 crores, apart from the Paper Currency Reserve of 37.05 crores has been built up. The Reserve consists of separate Reserve Funds for Debt Redemption, Famine Relief, Industrial Development, O. S. Currency Stabilization, Securities Adjustment, Post-war Development, Budget Stabilization and Deposits. The Budget Estimates for the year 1354F (6th October 1944 to 5th October 1945, later reports are not available) showed an ordinary revenue of 1664.00 lakhs and an expenditure of 1355.08 lakhs, inclusive of large sums set aside for famine, insurance and debt redemption. The Post-war Development Reserve was primarily meant for meeting post-war needs, but the Budget Estimates for 1944-45 also provided for a total expenditure of Rs. 66.00 lakhs which included 10 lakhs for rehabilitation of soldiers and artisans returned from War, 15 lakhs for establishment of a College of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry, 10 lakhs for Industrial Research Laboratory and 10 lakhs for Women's College. The capital expenditure programme provided for an expenditure of 91.63 lakhs, which included 3.87 lakhs for preli-

minary survey of large irrigation projects and 100 lakhs for railway construction, 8.38 lakhs for Osmania University buildings, 11.97 lakhs for Military building, 12.20 lakhs for construction of Roads. The year opened with a cash balance of 430.94 lakhs which was expected to be 849.31 lakhs by the end of the year.

During the Second World War, in addition to the gifts of the Nizam and the contribution of the public and other direct and indirect War expenditure, the State subscribed 21 lakhs annually to the British War Effort. The direct and indirect expenditure connected with the War from its commencement to the end of 1353F. (5th October 1944) amounted to nearly 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ crores.

Hyderabad now probably looks for a dividend on its investments in the Allied Cause.

Osmania University, which was established at Hyderabad by a Charter in 1918, marked a new departure in Indian education as it imparted instruction in the Faculties of Arts, Science, Law, Muslim Theology, Medicine, Engineering and Education through the medium of Urdu, English being a compulsory language in the B.A. and B.Sc. examinations and examinations leading up to that stage. In addition to the University College comprising the Faculties of Arts, Science, Muslim Theology and Law, it has a Medical College, and an Engineering College, a Training College for teachers and a Women's College, teaching up to M.A. and M.Sc. and Dipin-Ed and M.Ed. Standards. The University also maintains five Intermediate Colleges, two in the City of Hyderabad and one each at Aurangabad, Warangal and Gulbarga. The total number of students in the colleges of the University is about 4,000. The annual expenditure is about 26 lakhs.

The principal industry of the State has been its agriculture, which maintains 56.2 per cent. of the population. The common system of land tenure is ryotwari. About 58 per cent. of the total area is directly administered by the State. The rest consists of private estates of His Exalted Highness the Nizam called Sarf-e-Khas and the estates of the Jagirdar and Paigah nobles altogether about 1100 in numbers. The total Land Revenue is over 3.3 crores. The principal food crops are rice, wheat, millets and pulses, the chief money crops are cotton, and oil seeds. Cotton is grown extensively on black cotton soil. The total area under cotton cultivation was about 2 million acres in 1944-45. Hyderabad is well-known for its Gaorani Cotton. It is one of the finest indigenous Cotton grown in India and is cultivated over an area of more than half a million acres.

Hyderabad possesses the most Southerly of the Indian Coalmines and the much of the South-India is dependent on them for such coal as is transported by rail. These mines produced 1,277,154 tons in 1942, but the output was reduced to 1,067,459 tons in 1943.

Textiles, Cement, Paper and Sugar are the chief industries of the State. There are six large Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills and 385 Ginning and Pressing factories. About one half of the cloth consumed in the State is manufactured locally on handlooms. Besides the State Shahabad Cement Works which produced 1,72,628 tons of cement in 1943, the question of establishing another Cement Factory at Mancheryal is under consideration. The Sirpur Paper Mills, whose further expansion is under consideration, is one of the most up-to-date Paper Mills in India. It not only supplied the requirements

of the State in these days of war, but also helped the Government of India and the British Indian Provinces to a considerable extent in meeting their requirements. The Nizam Sugar Factory has a cane crushing capacity of about 1,500 tons. Attached to this is a distillery for manufacturing alcohol out of molasses. There are four cigarette factories with a large export trade.

During the War several large-scale industries sprung up in the State. Noteworthy among them are a metal works, which supplied knives and cutlery on a large scale to the Ordnance Department, a machine tool works, starch factory, a chemical and pharmaceutical works, bio-chemical and synthetic products works, a factory for producing refined oils and manufacturing hydrogenated ghee, a soap factory and three glass factories, one of which is intended to manufacture sheet glass as well. The State is equipped with two roller flour mills and an Enammel Works and a Surgical dressing factory, a heavy Chemal Factory, a Plastics Factory, a Tannery Works, an oil cloth factory, a wire nails products and perfumery works.

As regards small scale industries it may be mentioned that button and die-pressing factories, of which there are 40 at present, have made great progress and earned good reputation far and wide. Besides a big biscuit factory with an appreciable export trade, there are two power-driven and twelve hand-worked match factories.

The number of factories registered under the Hyderabad Factories Act is 668.

The State of Hyderabad has been in the unique position of having within its limits the largest net-

work of railways in any Indian State and of being pioneers in the field of road-transport operated and controlled by an Indian Railway Administration.

132 miles of broad gauge line from Bombay to Madras traverse the State ; also 30 miles metre gauge of the Masulipatam to Mormugao line. At Wadi, on the Bombay-Madras line, the broad gauge system of His Exalted Highness the Nizam's State Railway takes off and running east through Hyderabad City and Warangal, reaches the Calcutta-Madras line at Bezwada, a total length of 338 miles. From Kazipet a link to Balharshah strikes north providing the shortest route between Madras and Delhi. From Secunderabad the metre gauge Godavari Valley Railway runs north-west for 386 miles to Manmad on the main line of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to Calcutta. A metre gauge line runs south from Secunderabad through Mahbubnagar to the border and connects with Dronachalm on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway. Branch lines exist from Purna to Hingoli, Parbani to Purli-Vaijnath, Karepalli to Kothagudium, Vikarabad to Bidar and Purli-Vaijnath and Jankampet to Bodhan. A branch line of 101 miles from Mudkhed to Adilabad is under construction. Thus with branch lines there are now 799 miles of broad gauge and 665 of the metre gauge in the State. The Barasi Light Railway owns a short extension of 36 miles from Kurduwadi on the Bombay-Madras Line to Latur in the Osmanabad District. The Nizam's State Railway was worked by a Company until April 1930, when it was purchased by His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government.

The Nizam has been most interested in air development, no doubt with an eye to the future. A further development in the co-ordination of all forms

of transport in Hyderabad was thus achieved by the formation early in 1938 of an Air Department under the State Railway Administration. The Department has been responsible for the training of personnel for Airline operation, for the operation of charter services and for the loan of machine and technical staff to the State Aero Club.

The State's Air Transport organisation at Begumpet during the War provided facilities for the training of Indian Air Force pilots on a large scale and foresight in building up the ground organisation and technique for the purpose of Air Development has made the present Air Force training centre possible.

The population of Hyderabad is 16 millions, including the Ceded Districts. More than 80 per cent. are Hindus, Muslims are no more than 17 per cent.

In the scheme adumbrated for Pakistan, Hyderabad formed an important part, not on the grounds of communal majority areas, but on an individual ground of "Patrimony".

The Patrimony of Hyderabad is confined to the ruler and a few families in Hyderabad who exploit both Hindus and Muslims alike.

More than 95 per cent. of the population have no voice in the administration. Hyderabad has no parallel with Kashmir. In Kashmir, although the population is mainly Muslim, economically, socially and politically they desire union with India. The Ruler has handed over the administration to a popular government headed by a very popular leader. Hyderabad clings tenaciously to the rule of an oligarchy.

The Rulers of Hyderabad for the most part have drawn their inspiration from Aligarh and Osmania both of which Universities the Nizam was the Chancellor. A narrow communalism has poisoned the social and political life of the State, for which the Nizam and his Court are largely responsible.

The Army and the police and high officials are mainly Muslim giving just ground for complaint to the vast majority of the population.

No great confidence is, however, placed on even the Muslim population as a wide gulf divides the nobility and ryots, a wholly un-Islamic economic order. The freedom with which wine is consumed by Hyderabad aristocracy would do credit to Paris and London. The orthodoxy of poorer classes contempt on the one hand and disgust on the other. And so the Nizam and his friends go about in search of mercenaries to man the army and the police. A large number of Arabs have joined the army of the Nizam and carry guns to his orders.

For many years, the Nizam has endeavoured, be it said to his credit, to import able administrators from India to organise and develop the revenue department of the State. Syed Sir Ali Imam, a former member of the Governor-General's Executive Council, held office for many years as Prime Minister. Nawab of Chatari and Sir Mirza Ismail are other important names who have been associated with Hyderabad in recent times. But gradually the power has passed from the Nizam and the Residency to the Ittehad-Musalmeen, the Hyderabad Edition of the All India Muslim League. On the appointment of Sir Mirza Ismail, Jinnah made a dash to Hyderabad to prevent the appointment, as Ismail was not one of his men. Ismail was no believer in Jinnah's policy of

communalism. But if Jinnah and his friends were not strong enough to get Ismail's appointment, they became strong enough to get rid of him later.

Hyderabad in 1947, on the eve of important changes in the constitutional set-up of the sub-continent, was a hotbed of intrigue.

NAWAB SALAR JUNG BAHADUR



CHAPTER V

THE FICTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

As we have already noted, when the final war with Tipu began, Hyderabad was not a large State. But when the war ended its boundaries were extended by the Nizam's acceptance of territory offered first to the Peshwa, on terms which he refused. They were extended again, another four years later, after the Second Anglo-Maratha war. Hyderabad to-day is as large as France, but "no State," says Edward Thompson, "can ever have combined such material importance with so undistinguished a record and so fictitious an independence."

According to the same authority: "Its importance was trivial in the extreme, and its independence completely fictitious, in the half century before the Mutiny, and perhaps most of all in Lord Wellesley's time." No one deviated from an attitude of steady contempt for it. Though Hyderabad was the Company's nominal ally against the Marathas, as against Tipu, Arthur Wellesley considered that it was "impossible for persons to have behaved in a more shuffling manner." The tergiversations of the Nizam's Government were a large part of the experience which led him to his conclusion, that events "ought to be a lesson to us to beware not to involve ourselves in engagements either with, or in concert with, or on behalf of, people who have no faith, or no principle of honour or of honesty, or such as usually among us guide the conduct of gentlemen, unless duly and formally authorised by our government."

In 1857, the Moghal Empire came to an end,

Under the proclamation of the Queen, the Government of India passed to the Crown.

Thereafter the Nizam rendered homage to the Crown. Until the most recent times he was under the Paramountcy of the Crown which included the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the State. The right was not merely theoretical. It was put into practice.

Sovereignty, therefore, in the real sense he never had.

Security from his neighbours and from his subjects was guaranteed in the Proclamation of the Queen and by Lord Canning on her behalf in 1862. Succession to the *gadi* was especially a subject for the approval of the Crown. The exercise of important rights such as grant of lands and railways, mines and forest rights—was always subject to the scrutiny by the Government of India.

According to International Law :

“ Protected states such as those included in the Indian Empire of Great Britain are not subjects of international law. Indian native states are *theoretically* in possession of internal sovereignty, and their relations to the British Empire are in all cases more or less defined by treaty ; but in matters not provided for by treaty a ‘ residuary jurisdiction ’ on the part of the Imperial Government is considered to exist, and the treaties themselves are subject to the reservation that they may be disregarded when the supreme interests of the Empire are involved, or even when the interests

of the subjects of the native princes are gravely affected. *The treaties really amount to little more than statements of limitations which the Imperial Government, except in very exceptional circumstances, places on its own action.* No doubt this was not the original intention of many of the treaties, but the conditions of English sovereignty in India have greatly changed since these were concluded, and the modifications of their effect which the changed conditions have rendered necessary are thoroughly well understood and acknowledged." (Treaties on International Law).

By a notification in the Gazette of India (21-8-1891) the Government of India declared that the principles of International Law have no bearing on the relation between the Government and natives under the suzerainty (protection) of the Queen Empress.

When the Nizam addressed his historic demands to Lord Reading on the 20th of September 1925, claiming that the relations of his Government with the Government of India were as "between two Governments that stand on the same plane without any limitation or subordination of one to the other," it created a flutter in political dovecotes and a controversy of no small magnitude. The Nizam was not alone. Many Princes in fact—possibly in all good faith—professed pretensions to sovereignty with concomitant regal honours which were, however, clearly unfounded. They used the language and the trappings of royalty. They referred to their "thrones," their "royal families," their "heir-apparents" and their "Prince of Wales." The attitude of the Gov-

ernment of India was one of mixed indifference, best expressed in the case of an assumption of the Tudor Crown on the table linen and crockery of a certain Prince. A certain section of Political Department was perturbed at this encroachment upon the Tudor Crown and sent up a formidable file on the subject. But Viceregal note consisted of two words—"drop it."

Apart from the tolerance towards the claims and trappings of the Princes, a looseness of expression—in quarters that ought to know better—has often added to the vagaries of the precise nature of their constitutional status, giving rise in turn to considerable confusion on the subject. In February 1923, Sir Mohammad Shafi, then Law Member of the Government of India, admonished the Council of State that "the Legislature should not interfere in the affairs of a sovereign State," and described the States as "sovereign States under the suzerainty of the British Government." In the proclamation of 19th April 1875, deposing the Gaekwar of Baroda, the British Government referred to the "sovereignty of Baroda." Sir Lee Warner in his classic on the Indian States (*Native States of India*, Macmillan, 1910) accepted Sir Henry Maine's proposition that sovereignty is divisible and described the States as possessing "internal sovereignty." Lord Curzon, generally so precise in his terminology, claimed the Princes as "partners and colleagues" in the administration of the country. Little wonder, therefore, that the Nizam considered himself Sovereign with the additional justification perhaps, by reason of his having been recognised as "a faithful ally." He presumed himself justified in claiming parity with the Government of India.

Lord Reading wisely realised that any "silence

on the subject now might hereafter be interpreted as acquiescence in the propositions," which the Nizam enunciated and felt incumbent "as His Imperial Majesty's representative to remove any misconception by His Exalted Highness." Lord Reading therefore informed the Nizam (27th of March, 1926) :

"The Sovereignty of the British Crown is supreme in India, and therefore no Ruler of an Indian State can justifiably claim to negotiate with the British Government on an equal footing. Its supremacy is not based only upon treaties and engagements, but exists independently of them and, quite apart from its prerogative in matters relating to foreign powers and policies, it is the right and duty of the British Government, while scrupulously respecting all treaties and engagements with the Indian States to preserve peace and good order throughout India. The consequences that follow are so well-known and so clearly apply no less to Your Exalted Highness than to no other Rulers, that it seems hardly necessary to point them out. I will merely add that the title "Faithful Ally" which your Exalted Highness enjoys has not the effect of putting your government in a category separate from that of other States under the paramountcy of the British Crown."

Lord Reading's declaration of the supremacy of the British Government meaning the Government of India (the Nizam claimed parity with the Government of India and not with the Government of Great Britain) did not however dispel the fog that admittedly surrounded the constitutional position.

Not only was the paramountcy still a matter of controversy, but so was the precise position of the Indian States in the Empire and their relations with the Crown in general. Lord Reading proclaimed the supremacy and the paramountcy of the Government of India. His Law Member had referred to the States as possessed of "internal Sovereignty." The terms were contradictory. What was the precise constitutional position even after the declaration of Lord Reading no one could definitely say. Some fell back to the mixed references to the States as "feudatories" and "semi-sovereign States," Lord Canning had declared that the Crown in 1858 was "brought face to face with its feudatories." Sir Henry Maine, followed by Sir Lee Warner, regarded the "Sovereignty" of the States as divided between the British Government and the Chiefs in varying degrees, a state of affairs referred to as "part sovereignty". Sir Louis Tupper, however, expressing the broad policy of the Political Department, had advanced the point of view that the States being "feudatory" were "subordinate to the Government of India, and as the Government of India was created by Parliament, the Government of India had full authority over the affairs of the States, whose rulers were agents or great hereditary officers for the administration of certain sections of the Empire." A similar viewpoint was also expressed by Dr. T. J. Lawrence who considered that though the States "are sometimes spoken of as independent States, in reality they are not even part sovereign in the sense given to that term in international law, for they may not make war or peace or enter into negotiations with any Power except Great Britain." International law really amounts to an agreement between equal and independent nations about their conduct to one another. It is authoritatively stated by the Government of India that the "principles of international

law have no bearing upon the relations between the Government of India as representing the Queen-Empress on the one hand, and the Native States under the suzerainty of Her Majesty. The paramount supremacy of the former pre-supposes and implies the subordination of the other." On these grounds Twiss called them "protected dependent states"; while Creasy maintained "that titular independence is not sovereignty if coupled with actual subjection." He further observed "such is the condition of the Native States."

Alongside the conflicting nature of some of these well-known authorities on constitutional law we had the unequivocal declaration of a succession of representatives of the crown that "the sovereignty of the Crown is everywhere unchallenged. It has itself laid down the limitations of its prerogatives." Lord Reading's letter to the Nizam merely paraphrased this view point. On the whole therefore the status of the Princes and the niceties of their relations with the Sovereign Power continued to be tinged with a vagueness about which experts agreed to differ and upon which laymen were loathe to intrude.

The result of these controversies was the Indian States Enquiry Committee, more popularly known as the Butler Committee. The Government of India gladly agreed to its appointment in the hope that it would settle the question of its Paramountcy once and for all. The Princes on whose initiative the Committee was appointed welcomed it, clutching the fond hope that it would equally once and for all recognise their internal sovereignty, *vis-a-vis* the Government of India. The Committee's terms of reference were :

" (1) to report upon the relationship between

the Paramount Power and the Indian States with particular reference to the rights and obligations arising from :

- (a) treaties, engagements and sanads, and
- (b) usage, suffrance and other causes ; and
- (2) to enquire into the financial and economic relations between British India and the States, and to make any recommendations that the Committee may consider desirable or necessary for their more satisfactory adjustment."

The Committee visited 15 States enjoying "a great and traditional hospitality." It travelled 8,000 miles in India and examined "informally" 48 witnesses. After the visit to the States "during the winter months," it adjourned to England where the case for the Princes were presented by eminent Counsel, headed by the Rt. Honourable Sir Leslie Scott. The meetings of the Committee were in secret and it refused to hear the representatives of the Indian States Peoples Conference. The terms of reference precluded enquiry into the private affairs of individual states, but important questions mainly of a constitutional nature were considered in private and *ex parte* of the Indian Legislatures, Indian State subjects and the Press. The Princes spent vast sums of money in presenting their claims and upon propaganda. In spite of their best efforts, the verdict of the Butler Committee went definitely against them. Sovereignty or the Supremacy, Powers and Privileges of the Paramount Power were established beyond any shadow of doubt. No wonder, therefore, the Chamber of Princes lost its temper.

The main contention pressed before the States Enquiry Committee on behalf of the Princes may be summarised as follows :—

- (1) “ The relationship between the Crown and the various Indian States is one of mutual rights and obligations and must be ascertained by legal criteria.”
- (2) “ The Indian States were originally independent, each possessed of full sovereignty, and their relationship *inter se* and to the British power in India was one which an international lawyer would regard as governed by the rules of international law.”
- (3) “ As soon as a treaty was made between the Crown and a State, the mutual rights and obligations flowing therefrom, and the general nature of the relationship so established could only be ascertained by reference to legal principles. This result has not been in any way affected either by lapses of time, or by change of circumstances.”
- (4) “ As each State was originally independent, so each remains independent, except to the extent to which any part of the ruler’s sovereignty has been transferred to the Crown. To the extent of such transfer the sovereignty of the state becomes vested in the Crown ; whilst all sovereign rights, privileges and dignities not so transferred remain vested in the ruler of the State.”
- (5) “ The phrase residuary jurisdiction is sometimes used in official language. In our

opinion it is the State and not the Crown which has all residuary jurisdiction."

- (6) "The Crown has no sovereignty over any state by virtue of the prerogative or any source other than cession from the ruler of the State. The idea which is held or seems to be held in some quarters that the Crown possesses sovereign rights not so transferred to it by the state is erroneous."
- (7) "Sovereignty, is, as between wholly independent states, susceptible of transfer from one holder to another by compulsory annexation or voluntary cession."
- (8) "A real cession, *i.e.*, a transfer which is really the act of the transfer, is essentially a product of voluntary agreement."
- (9) "Sir William Lee Warner suggests five channels as contributing to the rights or duties of the Indian Princes : (i) the Royal Prerogative, (ii) Acts of Resolutions of Parliament, (iii) The law of nature, (iv) Direct agreement between the parties, and (v) usage. With regard to the first two suggested channels or to use a word which seems to us to be more appropriate—sources of rights and duties, we are quite unable to find any legal principle on which it is possible to base a contention that either (i) the Royal Prerogative or (ii) Acts or Resolutions of the British Parliament can give to the Crown any rights against the States or impose any obligations upon them."

- (10) "The consent to the transfer to the Crown of any sovereign powers is the consent of each individual state given by its sovereign. Each State, and each occasion of transfer must be considered separately, in order to find out what the agreement was by which the consent of the states was given to any particular cession."
- (11) "Paramountcy bears the same meaning in relation to all the states, although the precise manner in which it is put into operation in any given circumstances may differ. In this sense, and in this sense only can it be said that the position of all the states *vis-a-vis* the Crown is the same. But it is the same not because the Crown has any inherent residuary rights, but because all the states have by agreement ceded paramount rights to the Crown."
- (12) "Agreement transferring sovereign rights normally expressed in treaty, though capable of being made informally : but onus of proof is then on the transferee, *i.e.*, the Crown".
- "When one side makes an agreement with another state effecting its sovereignty and thereby does an act of great public importance, it is usual to put the agreement into solemn form, in order to have an unimpeachable record, and to ensure that the signatories are properly accredited to bind their respective States."
- (13) (a) "We have already discussed certain as-

pects of paramountcy and have expressed the opinion that the relationship is founded upon agreement, express or implied, existing in the case of all the states, and that the mutual rights and duties, to which it gives rise, are the same in the case of all the States. In order to ascertain what these mutual rights and duties are it is necessary to consider what are the matters in respect of which there has been a cession of sovereignty on the part of all the States."

- (b) "The gift of the agreement constituting Paramountcy is, we think, that the State transfers to the Crown the whole conduct of its foreign relations—every other State being foreign for this purpose—and the whole responsibility of defence; the consideration for this cession of sovereignty is an undertaking by the Crown to protect the state and its ruler against all enemies and dangers external and internal, and to support the ruler and his lawful successors on the throne. These matters may be conveniently summarised as, and are on this opinion called, "foreign relations and external and internal security." We can find no justification for saying the rights of the Crown in this capacity as Paramount Power extend beyond these matters."

To the above proposition on behalf of the Princes, the States Enquiry Committee gave the following unanimous answers :

- (1) "We agree that the relationship of the States to the Paramount Power is a relationship to the Crown, that the treaties

made with them, or treaties made with the Crown, and that those treaties are of a continuing and binding force as between the States which made them and the Crown. We agree that it is not to say that "the treaties with the Native States must be read as a whole," a doctrine to which there are obvious objections in theory and in fact."

- (2) "On the other hand we cannot agree with certain statements and arguments that occur in this opinion. The relationship of the Paramount Power with the States is not merely a contractual relationship, resting on treaties made more than a century ago. It is a living, growing relationship shaped by circumstances and policy, resting as Professor Westlake has said, on a mixture of history, theory and modern fact. *The novel theory of a paramountcy agreement, limited as in the legal opinion, is unsupported by evidence, is thoroughly undermined by the long list of grievances placed before us which admit a Paramountcy extending beyond the sphere of any such agreement.*"
- (3) "It is not in accordance with historical fact that when the Indian States came into contact with the British Power they were independent, each possessed of full sovereignty and of a status which a modern international lawyer would hold, to be governed by the rules of international law. In fact, none of the States ever held international status. Nearly all of them were subordinate or tributary to the Moghal Empire, the Maratha supremacy or the Sikh

kingdom, and dependent on them. Some were rescued, others were created by the British."

- (4) "We cannot agree that usage in itself is in any way sterile. Usage has shaped and developed the relationship between the Paramount Power and the States from the earliest times, almost in some cases, as already stated, from the dates of the treaties themselves. Usage is recited as a source of jurisdiction in the preamble to the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, (53 & 54 Vict. C. 37) and is recognised in decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."
- (5) "These important effects of the operation of usages and sufferance were pointed out by the Government of India in 1877. "The paramount supremacy of the British Government," it was then said, "is a thing of gradual growth ; it has been established partly by conquest ; partly by treaty ; partly by usage ; and for a proper understanding of the relations of the British Government to the Native States, regard must be had to the incident of this *de facto* supremacy, as well as to treaties and charters in which reciprocal rights and obligations were recorded, and the circumstances under which those documents were originally framed. In the life of States, as well as of individuals, documentary claim may be set aside by overt acts ; and a uniform and long continued course of practice acquiesced in by the party against whom it tells, whether that party be the British Government or the

Native States, must be held to exhibit the relations which in fact subsist between them."

(6) "It is not in accordance with historical fact that Paramountcy gives the Crown definite rights and imposes upon it definite duties in respect of certain matters only, *viz.*, those relating to foreign affairs and external and internal security, unless these terms are made to cover all these acts which the Crown through its agents has considered necessary for imperial purposes, for the good government of India as a whole, the good government of individual states, the suppression of barbarous practices, the saving of human life, and for dealing with cases in which rulers have proved unfit for their position. It is not in accordance with historical fact to say that the term 'subordinate co-operation' used in many of the treaties is concerned, solely with military matters. The term has been used consistently for more than a century in regard to political relations. In these and other respects the opinion of counsel appears to us to ignore a long chapter of historical experience."

(7) "We are concerned with the relationship between the Paramount Power and the States as it exists today, the product of change and growth.

(a) *The Indian States have no international life. For international purposes state territory is in the same position as British territory, and state subjects are in the same position as British*

subjects. Since a foreign power will hold the Paramount Power responsible for injuries to its subjects committed in an Indian State, the Paramount Power is under obligation to see that those subjects are fairly treated. Of these duties Professor Westlake very truly says that they are owed by the states to Great Britain "as the managing representative of the Empire as a whole."

- (b) The Paramount Power is responsible for the defence of both British India and the Indian States and, as such, has the final voice in all matters connected with defence including establishments, war material, communications, etc.

It follows that the Paramount Power should have means of securing what is necessary for strategical purposes in regard to roads, railways, aviation, posts, telegraphs, telephones, and wireless, cantonments, forts, passage of troops and the supply of arms and ammunition.

- (c) *The guarantee to protect a Prince against insurrection carries with it an obligation to enquire into the causes of the insurrection and to demand that the Prince shall remedy legitimate grievances, and an obligation to prescribe the measure necessary to that result.*

The promise of the King-Emperor to maintain unimpaired the privileges, rights and dignities of the Princes carries with it a duty to protect the Princes against

attempts to eliminate him, and to substitute another form of government.

If they were due, not to misgovernment, but to a widespread popular demand for change, the Paramount Power would be bound to maintain the rights, privileges and dignity of the Princes ; but it would also be bound to suggest such measures as would satisfy this demand without eliminating the Princes. No such case has yet arisen or is likely to arise if the Prince's rule is just and efficient, and in particular if the advice given by His Excellency Lord Irwin to the Princes, and accepted in principle by their Chamber, is adopted in regard to a fixed privy purse, security of tenure in the public service and an independent judiciary.

- (d) The history of intervention has already been described. Intervention may take place for the benefit of the Prince, or the State, of India as a whole.

It is only on the ground that its interference with state sovereignty is for the economic good of India as a whole that the Paramount Power is justified in interposing its authority. It is not justified in interposing its authority to secure economic results which are beneficial only or mainly to British India in a case in which the economic interests of British India and the States conflict."

- (8) "These are some of the incidents and illustrations of Paramountcy. We have

endeavoured, as others before us have endeavoured, to find some formula which will cover the exercise of Paramountcy, and we have failed, as others before us have failed, to do so. The reason for such failure is not far to seek. Conditions alter rapidly in a changing world. Imperial necessity and new conditions may at any time raise unexpected situations. Paramountcy must remain paramount ; it must fulfil its obligations defining or adapting itself according to the shifting necessities of the times and the progressive development of the States. Nor need the States take alarm of this conclusion. Through paramountcy and paramountcy alone have grown up and flourished those strong and benign relations between the Crown and the Princes on which at all times the states rely. *On Paramountcy and Paramountcy alone can the States rely for their preservation through the generations that are to come. Through paramountcy is pushed aside the danger of destruction or annexation.*"

- (9) " Realising this, the states demand that without their own agreement the rights and obligations of the Paramount Power should not be assigned to persons who are not under its control, for instance, an Indian government in British India responsible to an Indian Legislature."

Translated into ordinary language, the existence of the States was dependent on the existence and continuation of the Paramountcy. The States were held to be largely the creation of the British Government, their Sovereignty a fiction.

There is another but not less important aspect of the so-called sovereignty of the States which is so generally overlooked. If there is a sovereignty, part or otherwise, in whom does this vest? Does it vest in the ruler or in the people or in the ruler and the people, the composite political entity called the State. More important than the theoretical attributes of sovereignty is the relationship of the ruler to his subjects.

Let us look into this question a little more closely. The corner stone of political theory has long been the principle of the State's sovereignty. It is sheer confusion to identify anarchy or self-sufficiency with sovereignty. The former may be a practical translation of a political and legal theory. The assertion of sovereignty carries with it the suggestion and rejection of a possible division of authority. Hence the doubtful value of Sir Henry Maine's description of Indian States as part sovereign. It is true that the authority of the King, even in the periods of extreme absolutism, did not reach the length that the theory demanded. But custom and established law were stubborn facts and the truth is that no absolute monarch ever actually obtained more than a very limited power to impose his will upon the common law of the folk or people. Sovereignty rests only in the State and the State is merely a personification of Sovereignty. But the essential characteristics of the State is not supremacy but the fact that its powers are self-derived or inherent in it as a collectivity. There are therefore both sovereign and non-sovereign states. With this Crabbe agrees. (The Idea of the Modern State.) The members of the American feudal union are states because they are juristic persons with inherent powers but they are not sovereign.

The fundamental aspect of the modern state is

thorough-going subjection to law. The law represents an actually achieved evaluation of interests. Such an evaluation of interest yields the standards by which conduct is judged and gives rise to such broad categories as right and wrong, lawful and unlawful. Even in ancient time the fact has been established, the authority of the sovereign was limited by the rights of the people. The sovereign could change the law of the people only in co-operation with those members of society whose social standing was recognised. "The Divine Right to govern wrong" was always short-lived. The consent of the classes affected was necessary in order to abridge any of their rights in the interests of the sovereign. It was quite early recognised that the sovereign is established by contract in which the community subjects itself to this authority. The contract is with the ruler by which a *summus magistratis* is set up and endowed with limited sovereignty, with a provision for his recall in case his powers are misused. This contract establishes the supreme authority: the people agreeing among themselves that each gives up his right to a single person or assembly on condition that others do the same. The obligation to the "sovereign" as Thomas Hobbs maintained was always considered "to last as long and no longer than the power lasteth by which he is able to protect them."

The basis therefore of a monarchy or an oligarchy or a democracy would appear to have been the same; the authority of the nation to one, a few or the many to perform the administration of the State. The people as a community or *universitas* subordinates itself to a ruler by a *pactum subjectionis* and thus constitutes the State. Every government is therefore merely what Rousseau aptly describes as a "commission du peuple" which carries out a mandate revocable at any moment by the general will which

in itself constitutes the positive law. *Rex nihil potest quod de jure potest* for the King could do nothing except what he could under the law. Upon the principles enunciated, which are the general basis of both the modern and ancient theory of the state, we arrive at three important conclusions :

- (1) that in as much as most of the Ruling Houses of the Indian States govern without the consent and approval of their subjects, there is no *pactum subjectionis* between the rulers and their subjects,
- (2) the Paramount Power could not validly maintain the rights and privileges of a Prince who had lost the confidence of his people,
- (3) that unless there is a rule of law, it is not a state in the juristic sense. There may be a titular ruler, there may be boundaries, revenues may be raised and yet there may be anarchy or the absence of the rule of law. Anarchy need not be violent. Anarchy is the absence of law and anarchy may exist where one man holds sway or where the mob hold sway. His Excellency Lord Irwin referred to the rule of the Princes as a "personal rule." Personal rule without a *pactum subjectionis* is anarchy.

This is the position of Hyderabad today after the lapse of paramountcy.

In setting up the two new Dominions of India and Pakistan, Parliament, with one stroke of the pen

cut loose more than five hundred and odd states. One short clause abrogated several thousand treaties, sanads and engagements many of which were landmarks on the history of the British Empire in India.

According to Section 7 sub-clause 6 of the Indian Independence Act "As from the appointed day" the suzerainty of His Majesty over the Indian States lapses, and with it, all treaties and agreements in force at the date of the passing of this Act between His Majesty and the rulers of Indian States, all functions exercisable by His Majesty at that date with respect to Indian States, all obligations of His Majesty existing at that date towards Indian States or the rulers thereof, and all powers, rights, authority or jurisdiction exercisable by His Majesty at that date in or in relation to Indian States by treaty, grant, usage, sufferance or otherwise." An exception was, however, recognised in respect of agreements relating to "customs, transit and communications, post and telegraphs and other like matters," until the provisions in question are denounced by the ruler of the Indian States or persons having authority in the tribal areas on the one hand or by the Dominion or other part thereof on the other hand.

Paraphrased in ordinary parlance, the lapse of suzerainty is the lapse of His Majesty's protection and accordingly with it as states, all treaties and agreements in force between His Majesty and the rulers of the Indian States, and all powers exercisable by His Majesty in relation to Indian States by treaty, grant, usage, customs and otherwise.

According to some, the severance of the Crown's functions automatically established the rulers of the States as 500 odd new independent kingdoms forgetting only a very small number could claim a

title older than that of the British Government or one not originally derived from an office under the Moghul Emperor.

In reality, the abrogation of all treaties and engagements with the Nizam, left His Exalted Highness in the unexalted position of a common usurper with neither law, treaty nor usage to acclaim him.

CHAPTER VI

THE MIRACLE.

The abrogation of the Paramountcy, and the statutory termination of treaties, engagements and sanads severed all tangible links between the new Dominions and the 562 units constituting the States. Pakistan like India was also effected but to a very much smaller extent. Geographically the States that could accede to that Dominion were no more than a bare dozen. India had a far more extensive problem to restore ordered relations with several hundred units, not few of whom imagined that in the new order they had become independent Sovereigns.

The problem of the States was aggravated by the stubborn realities of geography. The territories of the Indian States were dovetailed into, and closely interwoven with, those of what was the British India. Even when the map showed solid blocks of the Indian States the territories were so irregular that the States had enclosures in the Provinces and *vice versa*. As the Butler Committee observed :—

“Politically there are . . . two Indias, British India, governed by the Crown according to the statutes of Parliament and enactments of the Indian Legislature, and the Indian States under the suzerainty of the Crown and still for the most part under the personal rule of the Princes. Geographically India is one and indivisible, made up of pink and yellow. The problem of statesmanship is to hold the two together.”

If that was the problem of statesmanship twenty years ago, it was the far more important and urgent problem of statesmanship in June, 1947, when the Indian Independence Bill, somewhat recklessly, perhaps, sought to sever the bonds of Paramountcy.

If patriotism and statesmanship of the highest order had not come to the rescue, India would have settled down to an era of stark chaos.

Sub-section (1) of Section 311 of the Government of India Act, 1935, which has now been omitted, defined 'Indian States' as including any territory, whether described as a State, an Estate, a Jagir or otherwise belonging to or under the suzerainty of a Ruler who is under the suzerainty of His Majesty and not being a part of British India ! In political practice the term applied to a political community occupying a territory in India of defined boundaries and subject to a common Ruler who enjoyed or exercised, as belonging to him, any of the functions and attributes of internal sovereignty duly recognized by the Paramount Power.

The Butler Committee and the Simon Commission applied this elastic term to 562 units, whereas the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms referred to 600 units as States. The term covered at one end of the scale units like Hyderabad and Kashmir, which were of the size of the United Kingdom, and at the other and minute holdings in Kathiawar extending only to a few acres.

Out of the total area enclosed within the territories of pre-partition India, *i.e.*, 15,81,410 square miles, the Indian States covered an area of 7,15,964 square miles, which constituted about 45 per cent. of the total Indian territories. In post-partition



India, the area covered by the States geographically contiguous to India was reduced to 5,87,888 square miles, being about 48 per cent. of the total area of the Dominion of India, *viz.*, 12,20,099 square miles. The Kashmir State with a territory of 84,471 square miles and the Hyderabad State closely following it with a territory of 82,313 square miles constituted the largest territorial units amongst the States. There were 15 States which had territories of more than 10,000 square miles and 67 having territories ranging from 1,000 to 10,000 square miles. There were 202 States having each an area of less than 10 square miles.

The total population of the states according to the census figures of 1941 was 9,31,89,233 constituting about 24 per cent. of the total population of pre-partition India, namely, 38,89,97,955 ; after partition the total population of the Dominion of India was reduced to 31,89,12,506 and of the States within the geographical orbit of the Indian Dominion to 8,88,084,34 changing the relative population ratio of the States from 24 per cent. to 27 per cent.

In pre-partition India 16 States had a population of over one million. These 16 States *plus* 4 other with a population of more than 7.50 lakhs but less than a million were assigned individual representation in the Constituent Assembly. These 20 States claimed 60 seats in the Constituent Assembly as against 33 seats assigned to the rest of the States. Of these 20 States, 11 were entitled to send two or more representatives. Of the rest 13 had a population between five and seven and a half lakhs. The remainder of the 140 States which were members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right had a population ranging from 25,000 to 5,00,000.

Prior to 1921, the 562 odd principalities had no inter-communication with one another. In that year by Royal Proclamation the Chamber of Princes was brought into being at the time that the Montford Reforms were introduced in India.

The establishment of the Chamber did not affect the individual relations between any State and the Representative of the Crown but it involved a deviation from the earlier policy under which the Crown discouraged joint action and deliberation between the Indian States.

The Federal Scheme embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, was the first effort to provide for a constitutional relationship between the Indian States and the Government of India on a federal basis. One of the special features of this scheme was that, whereas in the case of the Provinces accession to the federal was to be automatic, in the case of the States accession was to be voluntary and the establishment of the contemplated federation was conditional on the accession of States entitled to fill not less than 52 seats of the Council of State, and having an aggregate population of not less than one half of the total population of the States.

The accession was to be effected by the king's acceptance of an Instrument of Accession, the terms of which made it clear that the Act asserted no authority over the State save such as flowed from the Ruler's freely-executed Instrument. In the extra-federal field the paramountcy of the British Crown was to continue.

The promulgation of the Act of 1935 was followed by protracted negotiations during the course of which the draft of the Instrument of Accession underwent

several changes. However, till September, 1939, when the suspension of negotiations on that behalf was announced, the establishment of the contemplated federation was not in sight. To the Princes much of the essence of federation appeared to turn out to be the negation of all to which they had been accustomed. Their approach to the problems was governed by the view that their accession to federation involved a process of levelling down so far as their internal sovereignty was concerned, as against the Provinces which were to be levelled up as autonomous units and that, therefore, the Provinces and States could not be treated alike. On the other hand, progressive public opinion in British India hardened against the apparent effort of the Princes to whittle down the content of their accession to a farce, as also against such reactionary features of the federal scheme as the installation of dyarchy at the Centre in the form of the reserved subjects in the hands of the Governor-General. In the meantime, the Muslim League veered round to a position of determined hostility to all constitutional plans which envisaged a common centre for the whole of India. Denounced by the main political elements in India for diverse reasons, the federal scheme of 1935 died "unhonoured" and "unsung."

On 19th February, 1946, the Secretary of State for India, Lord Pethic-Lawrence, announced his Government's decision to send a delegation of three Cabinet Ministers to India.

The Cabinet Mission which consisted of Lord Pethic-Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. A. V. Alexander, arrived in India on 23rd March, 1946. In earlier announcements the States had been assured that there was no intention on the part of the Crown to initiate any change in their relationship

with the Crown without their consent. It was, however, expected that the consent of the Princes to any changes which might emerge as a result of negotiations would not be unreasonably withheld. In his letter to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, dated 12th May 1946, Lord Wavell repeated the assurance that there was no intention of making proposals for the entry of States into the Indian set-up on any basis other than negotiation.

On May 12, 1946, the Cabinet Mission issued a Memorandum in regard to the States, Treaties, and Paramountcy :

“ Prior to the recent statement of the British Prime Minister in the House of Commons an assurance was given to the Princes that there was no intention on the part of the Crown to initiate any change in their relationship with the Crown or the rights guaranteed by their treaties and engagements without their consent. It was at the same time stated that the Princes’ consent to any changes which might emerge as a result of negotiations would not unreasonably be withheld. The Chamber of Princes has since confirmed that the Indian States fully share the general desire in the country for the immediate attainment by India of her full stature. His Majesty’s Government have now declared that if the succession Government or Governments in British India desire independence no obstacle would be placed in their way. The effect of these announcements is that all those concerned with the future of India wish her to attain a position of independence within or

without the British Commonwealth. The Delegation have come here to assist in resolving the difficulties which stand in the way of India fulfilling this wish.

“ During the interim period, which must elapse before the coming into operation of a new Constitutional structure under which British India will be independent or fully self-Governing, paramountcy will remain in operation. But the British Government could not and will not in any circumstances transfer paramountcy to an Indian Government.

“ When a new fully self-Governing or independent Government or Governments come into being in British India, His Majesty's Government's influence with these Governments will not be such as to enable them to carry out the obligations of paramountcy. Moreover they cannot contemplate that British troops would be retained in India for this purpose. Thus as a logical sequence and in view of the desires expressed to them on behalf of the Indian States, His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by the States to the paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States

entering into a federal relationship with the successor Government or Governments in British India, or failing this, entering into particular political arrangements with it or them."

His Majesty's Government's Statement of 3rd June 1947, which superseded the Cabinet Mission's Plan of 16th May 1946, contained the following reference to the States :—

"His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that the decisions announced above relate only to the British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission Memorandum of 12th May, 1946, remains unchanged."

As the recent White Paper on the Indian States says :—

The decision to partition India was a severe blow to the political and geographical integrity of India. The unity of what was to be left as India after the partition, was so vital a necessity not only for the political strength, full economic development and cultural expression of the Indian people, but also for facing the aftermath of the partition, that the Government of India could not view with equanimity any trifling with it. The situation was indeed fraught with the gravest danger for as Professor R. Coupland has put it "India could live if its Muslim limbs in the north-west and north-east were amputated; but could it live without its heart?". The first task to which the newly created States Department had to address itself, therefore, was the conserving of the heart of India, This required a com-

mon centre for the whole country including the Indian States, able to function effectively in the Provinces and States alike in matters requiring all-India action.

On the day the States Department came into being, *i.e.*, 5th July, 1947, the Hon'ble Sardar Patel, Member for States Department, issued an important statement defining the policy of the Government of India, in which he assured the States that no more was asked of them than accession on the three subjects of Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications, in which the common interests of the country were involved, and that their autonomous existence would be scrupulously respected. He gave a further assurance that it would not be the policy of the States Department to conduct the relations with the States in any manner which savoured of the domination of one over the other ; and that if there would be any domination, it would be domination of mutual interests and welfare. The Hon'ble Member expressed the hope that the Indian States would bear in mind that the alternative to co-operation in the general interest was anarchy and chaos which would overwhelm great and small in a common ruin if the States and Provinces were unable to act together in the minimum of common task.

The Statement made by the Hon'ble Member for the States Department was favourably received in the Princely circles and informal consultations which followed paved the ground for the negotiations leading up to the execution of the Instruments of Accession and Standstill Agreements.

While Lord Mountbatten and Sardar Patel were doing everything possible to rescue the unity of what remained as India, Mr. Jinnah as ever mischief-

bent saw in the new problem of the States fertile ground for mischief, in which Zafar Ullah Khan, Federal Court Judge, was a useful adept. After having successfully brought about the resignation of the Khizar Ministry to pave the way of a Muslim League Ministry in the Punjab, Zafar Ullah Khan, with Jinnah's approval became Constitutional Adviser to the Nawab of Bhopal, the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, resigning his seat on the Federal Court.

It was Zafar Ullah Khan's job to see that Muslim States within the Dominion of India should either remain independent or accede to Pakistan, thus creating centres of Pakistan influence within the Dominion of India itself. With this end in view, Jinnah promulgated a gratuitous opinion on the legal position of the Indian States ("Dawn", June 18, 1947) :—

“ Constitutionally and legally Indian States will be independent Sovereign States on the termination of Paramountcy and they will be free to decide for themselves to adopt any course they like ; it is open to them to join the Hindustan Constituent Assembly or Pakistan Constituent Assembly or decide to remain independent. In the last case they can enter such arrangements or relationship with Hindustan or Pakistan as they may choose.

“ I am clearly of the opinion that the Cabinet Mission's Memorandum of May 12, defining the policy of H. M. G. towards Indian States, does not in any way limit them as it is often wrongly repeated that they have no option to join one or the other Constituent Assembly. In my opinion, they

are free to remain independent if they so desire. Neither the British Government nor British Parliament nor any other power or body can compel them to do anything contrary to their free will and accord ; nor have they any power or sanction of any kind to do so."

Jinnah tried his best to queer the pitch as much as possible. On July 25, Lord Mountbatten held a meeting of the Princes and explained to them in forceful terms the necessity to accession to the Dominion of India. And while the Sub-Committee was examining the Draft of Instrument of Accession and Draft Standstill Agreements, Mr. Jinnah issued a statement through the Associated Press of India. ("Dawn" July 31, 1947) :—

"I have been asked from certain quarters to indicate what the attitude of the new Pakistan Government is likely to be in respect of Indian States after the lapse of Paramountcy. I thought that I had already made the position perfectly clear. The legal position, with the lapse of Paramountcy on the transfer of Power by the British in all Indian States, would be that they would automatically regain their full sovereign and Independent status. They are, therefore, free to join either of the two Dominions or remain independent.

"The Muslim League recognises the right of each State to choose its destiny. It has no intention of coercing any State into adopting any particular course of action. If a State desires to join the Pakistan Dominion or enter into any understanding or treaty,

the Negotiating Committee of the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, when set up, or representatives of the Government of Pakistan, as the case may be, will be glad to negotiate terms on which such associations can be brought about. While, it is desirable to conclude such negotiations quickly, no definite time limit can obviously be placed on their completion as this will, in my opinion, amount to interference with the State's freedom of choice.

Meanwhile, there is already a provision for a Standstill Agreement to fill up any void that may arise in the administrative field. This Standstill Agreement would take care of the immediate problem that may result from the lapse of Paramountcy."

No doubt Jinnah was assured that if this view prevailed with the Princes—it would certainly be popular with them—he could definitely count on the accession to Pakistan of Bhopal, Junagadh, Sachin, Janjira, Tripura, and several others among the States and make an alliance with Hyderabad, Travancore and some others which were inclined to bear strongly towards the theory of Sovereign Independence of the States.

While the British Government was now irrevocably committed to the termination of the Paramountcy on the introduction of independence for India and Pakistan, they realized at the last moment that chaos must ensue if on the declaration of Independence, no arrangements were made to secure the continuity of Communications, Defence, and External Affairs. And so Lord Mountbatten, the architect of the Indian Independence Bill, persuaded the British

Government to add a rider to clauses (b) and (c) of Section 7. The proviso secured that notwithstanding anything in clauses (b) and (c) (namely the lapse of the Suzerainty of His Majesty over Indian States and in the Tribal areas and all treaties and engagements in force on the appointed day), effect shall continue to be given, as nearly as may be, to the provision of any such agreement as relate to Customs, Transit, and Communications, Posts and Telegraphs and other like matters, until the provisions are denounced or superseded by subsequent agreement.

The prospects of chaos, however, were not by far at an end so long as either in theory or in fact States were free to form alliances with or against each other, to conspire with foreign interests, to march against one another or to encroach on the units of the Dominion of India to denounce the engagements relating to Communications and to set up and pull down Customs barriers.

On July 25, 1947, a Conference of Rulers and representatives of Indian States was held in the Chamber of Princes under the presidency of Lord Mountbatten in his capacity as Crown Representative. Addressing the Conference the Viceroy said :—

“ The States have complete freedom—technically and legally they are independent. Presently I will discuss the degree of independence which we ourselves feel is best in the interest of your own States. But there has grown up during the period of British administration, owing to the fact that the Crown Representative and the Viceroy are one and the same person, a system of co-ordinated administration on all matters of common concern which

meant that the sub-continent of India acted as an economic entity. That link is now to be broken. If nothing can be put in its place, only chaos can result, and that chaos, I submit, will hurt the States first—the bigger the State the less the hurt and the longer it will take to feel it—but even the biggest of the States will feel itself hurt just the same as any small State.

“ Let us turn for one moment to the Cabinet Mission Plan of 16th May, 1946. In this Plan the proposal was that the States should surrender to the Central Government three subjects—Defence, External Affairs, and Communications. That was a plan which, to the best of my belief, every Ruler and every State accepted as reasonable, fair and just. I talked with so many Rulers and everyone felt that Defence was a matter that a State could not conduct for itself. I am not talking of internal security but of defence against external aggression. I submit, therefore, that if you do not link up with one or the other Dominions, you will be cut off from any source of supplies of up-to-date arms or weapons.

“ External Affairs is inextricably linked up with Defence. External Affairs is something again which is outside the boundaries of India in which not even the greatest State can operate effectively. You can hardly want to go to the expense of having Ambassadors or Ministers or Consuls in all these foreign countries ; surely you want to be able to use those of India and Pakis-

tan. Once more I suggest that External Affairs is something that you have not dealt with since the formation of the East India Company. It would be difficult to operate and will also be source of embarrassment for you to have to take it up and it can only be managed by those who manage the Defence of the country. I submit that if you take it up it will be a liability and not an asset.

“The third subject is Communications. Communications is really a means of maintaining the life-blood of the whole sub-continent. I imagine everybody agrees that the country has got to go on. The continuity of Communications is already provided for to a certain extent in the Indian Independence Act ; and most of the representatives here have come to discuss it as item 2 on the agenda.

“Therefore, I am sure you will agree that these three subjects have got to be handled for you, for your convenience and advantage by a larger organization.

“The whole country is passing through a critical period. I am not asking any State to make any intolerable sacrifice of either its internal autonomy or independence. My scheme leaves you with all the practical independence that you can possibly use and makes you free of all those subjects which you cannot possibly manage on your own. You cannot run away from the Dominion Government which is your neighbour any more than you can run

away from the subjects for whose welfare you are responsible.”

The Nawab of Bhopal asked His Excellency what would happen if a State did not accede to either Dominion.

It is said His Excellency picked up a paper weight and brought it down with a thud on the pad before him :

“ God help it,” he said.

And so the impending transfer of full power to a National Government having the will and the sanction of the Indian people behind it, personal contact between the leaders of public opinion in India and the Rulers of States rendered possible by the withdrawal of the Paramount Power's previous policy of political isolation of States, and the patriotic lead given by some of the leading Princes enabled the Rulers of States to appreciate that it was both in the interest of their States and the country that the States should become actively associated with the Dominion Government instead of holding a watching brief as it were in the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly. With their valuable assistance and co-operation and the helpful efforts of Lord Mountbatten, negotiations were concluded in a week's time and, barring Hyderabad, Kashmir and Junagadh, all the States in the geographical limits of India acceded to the Indian Dominion.

Not without just pride does the White Paper on the Indian States (1948) refer to this momentous achievement :—

“ The accession of the States to the Dominion of India was a momentous event in India's

history. The full significance of this important development can be appreciated only if it is viewed against its most unpropitious background. For over half a century, the States had been a sealed book so far as the leaders of public opinion in British India were concerned. High walls of political isolation had been reared up and buttressed to prevent the infiltration of the urge for freedom and democracy into the Indian States. Disruptive tendencies had been sedulously cultivated and encouraged and proposals for not only one but several Rajasthans were in the air. There were not a few who nursed the hope that, overwhelmed by the combined weight of the partition of India and the disruption of the States, the Government of India would go under.

“ In the context of these heavy odds and handicaps, the consummation of the ideal of a federal India, comprising both the Provinces and the States, was not a mean achievement. For the first time, after hundreds of years, India became welded into a constitutional entity.”

It is interesting to add that Bhopal and all other Indian States, excepting Hyderabad and Junagadh acceded to the Indian Dominion. Bhopal's Constitutional Adviser betook himself to Pakistan. Junagadh's subjects made it too hot for him. He too went to Pakistan. Junagadh by plebiscite joined the Union.

Meanwhile Jinnah completely forgot the opinion he held about the freedom of a State to accede to

either Dominion. Kashmir signed a Standstill Agreement with Pakistan, but that did not satisfy Jinnah—he wanted full accession, if not merger with Pakistan. That so putting his own legal opinion into the waste paper basket he waged war—first unofficially then openly, against Kashmir and India—although that State had exercised in due form its right of accession to either Dominion.

Hyderabad, however, was too large and too strongly placed to be coerced. Its Ruler and its other ruling elements were not inspired by patriotism. Public opinion of the vast majority of the populace could not effectively assert itself. Realizing that he was soon to be free of the paramountcy of the English, Mir Osman Ali Khan entrenched himself behind a wall of Arab muskets, deftly carried negotiations which he probably never had any intention to bring to fruition and utilized true an opportunity to the maximum advantage.

In the vast majority of other States, however, a miracle was in evidence.

The accession of the Indian States to the Dominion of India was the first phase of the process of fitting them into the constitutional structure of India. The second phase which has rapidly developed during the recent months has involved a process of two-fold integration, external integration, *i.e.*, consolidation of small States into sizeable administrative units, and inner integration, *i.e.*, the growth of democratic institutions and responsible Governments in the States.

With the advent of independence the popular urge in the States for attaining the same measure of freedom as was enjoyed by the people in the Provinces

gained momentum and unleashed strong movements for the transfer of power from the Rulers to the people. The Rulers, who were quick to appreciate the legitimate aspirations of their people, gave them responsible Government.

On December 14, 1947, came the first of the great mergers. The Orissa and Chhatisgarh States numbering 39 in all with an area of 56,000 square miles and a revenue of two crores and a population of seven millions merged in the Dominion by ceding full and exclusive authority, jurisdiction, and powers for and in relation to the governance of these States.

The merger of the Eastern States gave an impetus to the people of other States with limited resources to see a similar remedy for their difficulties. The Deccan States which had previously decided to merge their sovereignty in the proposed United Deccan State now decided in favour of the security that integration with a resourceful unit such as the Bombay Province could provide, as against the hazards of separate existence as small units. They signed merger agreements on 19th February, 1948, and subsequent dates. The other States signed similar agreements and all States in Deccan except Kolhapur have been administratively integrated with the province of Bombay. The seventeen Deccan States that have thus merged in Bombay covered an area of 7,651 square miles with a population of about 17 lakhs and a revenue of about rupees one crore and forty lakhs.

After prolonged discussions in Bombay on 17th March, 1948, the Rulers of the jurisdictional Gujarat States agreed that merger with the Bombay province was the only solution of their constitutional problem. One distinguishing feature of the merger agreements

signed by the Ruler of the Gujarat States on 19th March, 1948, is the provision for a Council of Rulers on the model of the Council of Rulers in the United States of Kathiawar, for deciding cases of disputed succession after reference of such cases to the High Court of Bombay and in accordance with the decisions of that Court.

A number of Rulers and the Chiefs of the East Punjab Hill States signed on 8th March, 1948, agreements ceding to the Dominion Government full and exclusive authority, jurisdiction and power for and in relation to the governance of their States. Other Rulers signed similar agreements on subsequent dates. Having regard to the wishes of the Rulers and the people of the Hill States that the territories of these States should be consolidated into one unit and the desirability of making available to those areas man-power and wealth-power resources of a large administrative unit, the Government of India have integrated these States into a centrally administered unit to be known as "Himachal Pradesh." The new province which comprises the territories of 21 Hill States with an area of 10,600 square miles, a population of about 9½ lakhs and a revenue of about 85 lakhs, came into being on 15th of April, 1948.

This form of consolidation of small States was first adopted in regard to the Kathiawar States which comprised 217 States, and estates (449 units if calculated on the basis of further fragmentation according to the number of share-holders), with varying territories and jurisdictions.

The scheme for the constitution of the new Kathiawar State to be known as "Saurashtra" was finalized in the last week of January, 1948.

The United State of Kathiawar has provided the model for similar Unions of States in other regions, namely, the United States of (a) Matsya, (b) Vindhya Pradesh, (c) Rajasthan, and (d) Gwalior, Indore and Malwa, and (e) the Patiala and East Punjab States Union.

The United States of Gwalior, Indore, and Malwa (Madhya Bharat) constitutes the largest of the Unions of States so far formed. It comprises 20 States in Central India including the major States of Gwalior and Indore. These States consist of blocks of territory separated by intervening portions of other States. Linguistically, culturally, historically and economically the region forms a compact block.

The latest Union of States that has been decided upon is one to be formed by the States in the East Punjab. The Covenant for the formation of this Union was signed by the Rulers of the six salute States of Patiala, Kapurthala, Jind, Nabha, Faridkot, Malerkotla and the two non-salute States of Nalagarh and Kalsia on 5th May, 1948.

Even more significant than the geographical changes that this bloodless revolution has brought about, has been the complete transformation of the inner set-up of the States. When the Paramountcy of the British Crown lapsed there were only a few States which had representative institutions ; most of these were inchoate and illusory and had hardly gone beyond the Provincial Legislatures under the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. During the recent months, however, practically every State has announced its intention to grant full responsible Government and in a vast majority of them power has already been transferred to the people.

In the short space of one year the impossible had become an established fact. The age of miracles had truly not come to an end.

CHAPTER VII

FIRE-EATERS AT LARGE.

No such miracle, however, rewarded the efforts to find a solution with Hyderabad in spite of prolonged deliberations at Delhi, Cabinet meetings at Hyderabad and much aerial traffic between the two capitals.

By August 15, 1947, and the strenuous efforts of Lord Mountbatten and the States Ministry deeds of accession and Standstill Agreements had been executed with all the States bar three—Kashmir, Junagadh, and Hyderabad. Kashmir signed a Standstill pact with Pakistan. The Nawab of Junagadh finding the Government of India in temporary embarrassment over the disorders in the West and the East Punjab acceded to Pakistan providing that Dominion with a base in the very heart of Saurashtra.

Hyderabad alone stood out, signing neither a "Standstill Agreement" nor a deed of accession. On June 15 almost immediately after the British Declaration of June 3, 1947, to transfer power to the two successor Dominion Governments, the Nizam issued a "Firman" declaring that Hyderabad would neither accede to Pakistan nor India but that as from August 15 the Nizam "shall become entitled to resume the status of an independent sovereign after the lapse of Paramountcy."

The position taken up by the Nizam was in accord with the view-point of Mr. Jinnah as to the right of an Indian State to consider itself independent after the lapse of the paramountcy of the British

power. The problem of Kalat had not yet confronted Pakistan. (Mr. Jinnah later, against all his previous professions, crashed Kalat into submission.)

No oppressive policy, however, towards Hyderabad was ever adopted although it was clear that the position taken up by the Nizam was clearly untenable from the point of view of any administration charged with the responsibility of the Government of India.

It was clear that the independence of the Nizam would not solve the Hyderabad problem. It would be the forerunner of a thousand of new problems. A sovereign Hyderabad in the hands of ambitious, unscrupulous adventurers would imperil the very existence of the Dominion itself. Justification of the viewpoint of the Government of India was also found in the fact that power in Hyderabad was concentrated in the hands of a political rump and a Ruler, who was consolidating his power by the importation of foreign arms and foreign mercenaries.

During August 1947 the Government of India was sufficiently pre-occupied with arson, rape, murder and mass migrations — harvest of the country's century-old foreign rule.

The Government of India clearly also could hardly coerce the Nizam, as, following in the footsteps of the Master, it was pledged to "non-violence". And so began the long and dreary march to find a solution by peaceful negotiation. After one year's marching the goal, on August 15, 1948, seemed as remote as ever.

However, as Lord Mountbatten had at the Conference of July 25, 1947, given some indications of

the consequences which might ensue if the States did not accede to either Dominion, the Nizam sent a delegation to Delhi, not to conclude an agreement but to bargain for time. Convinced by the Nizam's pretensions to find a peaceful solution of the problem, the Government of India granted him two months to finalise his attitude, forgetting that his attitude had already been finalised in his "Firman" of June 15 that he would not in any circumstances accede either to India or Pakistan. Considering his claims to independence, the refusal to accede to Pakistan was merely nominal.

What was important, however, was the refusal to accede to India.

It soon became clear, also, that the Nizam was not keen on arriving at any agreement with the Indian Government. For, side by side with peace parleys, he also started making preparations for a showdown. Arms and ammunition started pouring into Hyderabad; thousands of Arabs and Pathans entered the State and were enlisted in the State Army; and a virtual state of war was declared throughout the State. The Satyagraha movement launched by the State Congress, which demanded accession of Hyderabad to the Indian Union and immediate establishment of responsible government in the State, was put down with a heavy hand and a large number of Congress workers were put behind the bars.

To give a decisive blow to the democratic front, the Nizam mobilised the Majlis-i-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen under the leadership of Syed Kasim Razvi. The Razakars, as the members of the Majlis were called, were equipped with the latest weapons and given full military training.

A reign of terror was let loose in Hyderabad aided and abetted by the administration. The Razakars began to indulge in murder, loot and arson in an ever-increasing degree.

After the expiry of the two months' extension in October, 1947, negotiations were resumed between Lord Mountbatten and Mr. V. P. Menon (Secretary, Indian States Ministry) on the one hand and a Hyderabad delegation consisting of the Nawab of Chhatari, Prime Minister, Sir Sultan Ahmed and Sir Walter Monckton (the Nizam's Constitutional Adviser) on the other. A draft agreement was finalized by the two parties towards the end of October, but when at the instance of Razvi the Nizam refused to sign that, the Hyderabad delegation resigned. Nawab Moin Nawaz Jang was thereupon appointed leader of a new delegation, and Nawab Mehdi Yar Jang acting Premier. Late in November, however, the Nizam appointed Mir Laik Ali, a prominent businessman of Hyderabad, as Prime Minister and charged him with the introduction of "constitutional reforms."

After three months of protracted negotiations, a Standstill Agreement was concluded between the Nizam and the Indian Union on November 29, 1947. Stating that it had not yet been possible to reach final agreement regarding the permanent relationship between India and Hyderabad, the Standstill Agreement, valid for one year, ran as follows :

*" Agreement made this 29th day of November, 1947,
between the Dominion of India and the Nizam
of Hyderabad and Berar.*

*Whereas it is the aim and policy of the Dominion of
India and the Nizam of Hyderabad and Berar*

to work together in close association and amity for the mutual benefit of both, but a final agreement as to the form and nature of the relationship between them has not yet been reached.

And whereas it is to the advantage of both parties and existing agreements and administrative arrangements in matters of common concern should, pending such final agreement, as aforesaid, be continued.

Now, therefore, it is hereby agreed as follows :—

Article 1.—Until new agreements in this behalf are made, all agreements and administrative arrangements as to the matters of common concern including external affairs, defence, and communications which were existing between the Crown and the Nizam immediately before August 15, 1947, shall, in so far as may be appropriate, continue as between the Dominion of India (or any part thereof) and the Nizam.

Nothing herein contained shall impose any obligation or confer any right on the Dominion :—

- (i) to send troops to assist the Nizam in the maintenance of internal order ;*
- (ii) to station troops in Hyderabad territory except in time of war and with the consent of the Nizam which will not be unreasonably withheld, any troops so stationed to be withdrawn from the Hyderabad territory within six months of the termination of hostilities.*

Article 2.—The Government of India and the Nizam

agree for the better execution of the purposes of this agreement to appoint Agents in Hyderabad and Delhi respectively, and to give every facility to them for the discharge of their functions.

Article 3.—(i) Nothing herein contained shall include or introduce paramountcy functions or create any paramountcy relationship.

(ii) Nothing herein contained and nothing done in pursuance hereof shall be deemed to create in favour of either party any right continuing after the date of termination of this agreement, and nothing herein contained and nothing done in pursuance hereof shall be deemed to derogate from any right which, but for this agreement, would have been exercisable by either party to it after the date of termination hereof.

Article 4.—Any dispute arising out of this agreement or out of agreements or arrangements hereby continued shall be referred to the arbitration of two arbitrators, one appointed by each of the parties, and an umpire appointed by those arbitrators.

Article 5.—This agreement shall come into force at once and shall remain in force for a period of one year.

In confirmation whereof the Governor-General of India and the Nizam of Hyderabad and Berar have appended their signatures.

*Mir Osman Ali Khan, Mountbatten of Burma,
Nizam of Hyderabad and Berar. Governor General of India”.*

Letters were also exchanged between Lord

Mountbatten as Governor-General of India and the Nizam on several points covered by the Standstill Agreement.

As to trade agents in London and elsewhere it was agreed that the Nizam could appoint such Officers wherever he desires but they will not have any diplomatic status or functions and their work will be confined to matters of trade and commerce, that is trade interest on behalf of the Government of Hyderabad.

They would have to work in co-ordination with India's Trade Commissioners and, naturally, with India's diplomatic Officers. In other words they would work under India's supervision. The Nizam would not appoint diplomatic agents in any foreign country or any country of the Commonwealth.

The Nizam would not buy arms in any foreign country. The Government of India agreed to meet his "legitimate requirements." The request would only be met to the extent it is considered legitimate.

Indian troops would be withdrawn from Secunderabad in accordance with a programme to be agreed upon by the end of February, 1948. India would have the right to have her troops in Hyderabad territory in a war emergency and for a period not exceeding six months after the termination of hostilities.

The Residency would be handed over to the Nizam's Government as soon as they provide alternative accommodation for India's Treasury and other officials.

The Nizam said in his reference to subversive movements : " I am sure that in entering into this agreement both our Governments intend to do all they can to prevent subversive movements and propaganda in the territory of the other," while the Governor-General's reply read,

" The Government of India desire to assure Your Exalted Highness that it is their earnest desire to promote communal harmony and to maintain peace and security, and they will co-operate whole-heartedly with you to that end."

The Governor General noted that the Nizam had " no intention of acceding to Pakistan."

Ample concessions were thus made to the Nizam—the agreement being wide of the standard Standstill Agreements executed with other States.

It was clear that the Nizam's professions of a peaceful solution of outstanding problems had been accepted as otherwise India would not have agreed to withdraw her troops from Hyderabad.

The Nizam got a year to make up his mind and to ascertain which way the tide of fortune flowed in Kashmir. The Government of India got a respite from the necessity of opening a second front with Hyderabad, having in the meantime their hands full with Pakistan in the valley of Kashmir.

Sardar Patel, the Deputy Prime Minister, in a statement on Hyderabad in the Constituent Assembly hoped the period of one year " would enable both of us to pave the way for a permanent accession."

Sardar Patel said that under the settlement, all agreements and administrative arrangements on matters of common concern which formerly existed between the Crown Representative and Hyderabad State, except the Paramountcy functions, are to be continued as between the Government of India and Hyderabad State for a period of one year.

These agreements and arrangements covered a wide variety of matters, including the three subjects on which the accession of all the States has been accepted, *viz.*, defence, external affairs and communications.

“ I know ” continued the Sardar, “ that Hon’ble members would have been much more gratified, if, as a result of these talks, His Exalted Highness had found it possible for the State of Hyderabad permanently to accede to the Indian Dominion.

“ Such an accession would have been in accord not only with our cherished desire but also with the interests of both the Indian Dominion and Hyderabad State.

“ We, however, fully appreciated the internal difficulties in the State and, consistent with our policy to secure agreement, not by coercion, but as far as possible with the maximum degree of goodwill on both sides and with due regard to the over-all position in India, we felt that an agreement of this nature, even for a limited period, would have considerable advantage over the absence of any agreement whatsoever.

“ The period of one year would enable both of

us to forge closer relations and would, it is hoped, pave the way for a permanent accession.

“ The settlement makes it clear that Hyderabad does not propose to accede to Pakistan. This, if I may say so, is only right, for, placed as Hyderabad is, its destiny is inextricably bound up with that of India.”

But was the Nizam's Government really interested in all this ? It required a breathing space and the Standstill Agreement gave it. It had no intention whatever of honouring the agreement, and within a week of its conclusion a loan of Rs. 20 crores was offered to Pakistan and shortly afterwards an ordinance as promulgated depriving the Indian Currency of its legal tender in Hyderabad. These overt acts were taken almost simultaneously with a number of covert developments within the State, the most important among the latter being the raising of the strength of the Razakars from quarter of a million to half a million men under arms.

The Government of India, however, honoured the obligations under the agreement to its detriment even though it was clear that the Nizam had no intention of honouring his.

And when the last batch of Indian troops left Secunderabad in January, the Nizam's squads of fire-eaters were at large to threaten and coerce.

CHAPTER VIII

AN EXPERIMENTAL MARRIAGE

On November 20, 1947, India and the Nizam signed the Standstill Agreement already referred to. This was described by Mr. K. M. Munshi, India's Agent General in a mood of exuberant, but irresponsible optimism, as "an experimental marriage". "If"—added Mr. Munshi, "within a year a child is born, the marriage will continue. I am in Hyderabad as midwife and being a Brahmin my self, I am confident that a happy and bonny child will be born within that time."

But Hyderabad was in no mood to have any midwives from the Indian Union even though they belonged to the exalted Brahmin order. The first welcome India's Agent General received was a refusal by the Nizam Government to provide him with residential quarters. Frantic telegrams from Lord Mountbatten to the Nizam produced a permission to reside for a week only within the Residency. The midwife went to Hyderabad but returned to Bombay without suckling a babe. Indeed no one took much notice of the midwife at all.

Hindus bypassed Mr. Munshi out of fear of the administration. Muslims left him severely alone. The Ittehad had a profound contempt for Dhotis and Mr. Munshi wore his elegant Dhotis around the 'Char-Minar' as he wore them on Chaupatti beach.

Our Agent-General, therefore, found Hyderabad a lonely spot and relieved his boredom by frequent visits to Bombay and Bangalore.

Meanwhile a baby had been born in Hyderabad, a vicious, lusty infant. It was certainly not out of Indian wedlock even though merely experimental.

Mr. Munshi did everything possible to smooth out difficulties for the Nizam. He used all the influence in his power to suppress the agitation of the Hyderabad State Congress. Till then the Congress under the leadership of Swami Rama Nand Tirath had been uncompromising enemies of the Nizam's administration. Several of its leaders had been arrested and jailed. Under Munshi's advice the Congress degenerated into a critic of the Nizam's critics and "began to attack the more militant section of the Hyderabad peoples." And so according to a well-informed correspondent the original democratic demands of the Hyderabad Congress began to be watered down. Talk about "the need for reforms," about "gradual" constitutional progress and the "evil of violent action" started to creep into every political speech. Attempts were made to isolate those who demanded joint action with all parties, including the Andhra Mahasabha which was leading the Telingana peasantry. Until finally, State Congress workers were told in emphatic terms not to co-operate with what were called "subversive elements." The "midwife" was beginning to make his influence felt; the ruled were now starting to speak in the jargon of the rulers.

There had been Communist risings in Telingana Division. One village after village had refused to submit to the orders of a local landlord, who to suppress the movement resorted to all sorts of villainy. Many were beaten by hirelings, their women abducted and whole areas suffered under oppression. But the peasants stood their ground and the disease spread from village to village, Taluka to Taluka—

until it was clear that Telingana revolt was more than a symptom.

According to the author of "Storm over Hyderabad :

" When the full meaning of Telingana and its slogan of ' Land to the tiller ' became known, there began to develop the most remarkable realignment of forces that India had seen during recent years. There was a hurrying to and fro between the capitals of India, Pakistan, Hyderabad, and Britain. Urgent talks were arranged between the representatives of the Nizam and the Premiers of Madras, Bombay and the Central Provinces, between the Nizam and the Indian Government, between the Nizam and his British advisors.

" Forgotten were the crimes perpetrated by the Nizam and those loyal to him. Forgotten were the hateful jabberings of Razvi and his Razakars. Forgotten were the kisans of Telingana and the other people of Hyderabad. Forgotten were those who had liberated their villages from a centuries old serfdom. An emergency and an idea had united the enemies of yesterday.

" Telingana was a flame that threatened to destroy vested interests and, therefore, must be muffled. That is the position to-day and the hour for the familiar ' settlement ' has arrived. The slogans of ' Land to the tillers ' and ' No Compromise ' have unmasked the enemies of the people.

Telingana has struck at the root of the economic problem of the Indian Continent and, therefore, it is dangerous. It must be isolated, if not killed.

“ But Telingana has come to stay.”

Thanks to the Standstill Agreement, all opposition to the Nizam within and without the State soon came to a standstill. India, true to its word, withdrew its troops from Secunderabad. The British for nearly two centuries had not trusted their ‘ Faithful Ally ’ beyond the range of a common musket. Can it be said that fools dared walk where angels feared to tread ? And the British were no angels.

We have seen how the first indication of the manner in which the Nizam was going to honour the Standstill Agreement came within a few days of the signing of the pact. Twenty crores went to Pakistan from the Nizam Treasury to bolster the finances of a Dominion at war (though unofficially) with the Indian Union. The Nizam was consummating alliances, while India was consummating Truth.

And meanwhile the bonny baby at Hyderabad began to use his lungs. Razvi and other leaders of the “ Ittehad ” declared :

“ We are born fighters and protectors of the weak. We will be guided by the great tenets of the Quran. Now, my brothers, onward march. Never put back your sword in the sheath until your object is achieved. Hound out the enemy. Do not spare him. Mind not your troubles. We believe in God. We have no other friends except Allah, who has created this Islamic

State and who will never let us down. With the Quran in one hand and a sword in the other, let us march forward, cut our enemies to pieces, establish our superiority.

“ It would have been far better if the Indian Dominion had not goaded the tiger, that was lying, to needless fury. Who knows that the Hyderabad tiger, the Bengal tiger of Eastern Pakistan and the Kashmir tiger, roused from their lairs, might not greet one another at Delhi.”

The Government of India could not view these declarations with equanimity, and as early as the last week of April Pandit Nehru expressed the determination of his Government to solve the Hyderabad problem without delay, by war if necessary.

The Nizam, however, was in no mood to check the menace of the Razakars, whose basic creed has been maintenance of the Nizam's sovereignty. His agents, on the other hand, made a successful effort to secure support from British quarters, and Mr. Butler made a mischievous attempt to introduce the question of Hyderabad into a House of Commons debate on foreign affairs. Emboldened by this, the Nizam turned down an invitation from Lord Mountbatten to come to Delhi for a personal discussion with him.

The rejection of this invitation was almost immediately followed by an attack on the Bombay-Madras Mail while passing through Hyderabad territory. This incident brought matters to a head, and the Hyderabad Premier flew to Delhi for final consultations. This was the beginning of a long series of parleys, which ultimately resulted in a

break-down. The India Government made a number of concessions to the Nizam, including at least a nominal recognition of the right of concurrent legislation, and an increase in the strength of the State regular army, but they refused to accept anything less than accession in substance and responsible Government. A belated and disingenuous offer of a plebiscite from Hyderabad was rejected, unless the plebiscite was held under a truly popular administration which alone could guarantee an impartial verdict.

The long-drawn India-Hyderabad negotiations took a decisive phase on the night of June 14, when the Government of India handed over to Mir Laik Ali a draft agreement. This draft was considered at a 90 minute conference in the Government House. The Governor-General Lord Mountbatten, Prime Minister Nehru, the States Secretary Mr. V. P. Menon, the Hyderabad Premier Mir Laik Ali and his colleagues and Sir Walter Monckton, the Nizam's Constitutional Advisor took part in the conference. At the conclusion of the conference Mir Laik Ali drove to the airfield and took off for Hyderabad. Sir Walter Monckton did not accompany him.

Asked when he would return to Delhi, Mir Laik Ali told an A. P. I. reporter that everything would depend on his Ruler. He declined to discuss the outcome of the conference but counselled patience "till tomorrow morning."

It was later gathered from authoritative quarters that Mir Laik Ali was taking with him the draft agreement for the acceptance of the Nizam. It was believed that the Nizam's delegation was told that the draft agreement was the further most limit to which the Government of India would go and it

was now up to the Nizam to accept it or reject it. In so far as the Government of India was concerned they would treat the phase of negotiation as ended.

Though the principles of the agreement were fairly well-known and discussed in the Press from time to time, the States Secretary, Mr. V. P. Menon appealed to the Press not to give currency to reports on the draft agreement as he considered a disclosure of the details would be prejudicial to the delicate negotiations.

Informed quarters, however, agree that the proposals were most generous concessions to Hyderabad and in fact any public criticism in India on these concessions would have not caused surprise.

The draft agreement related to three main points which included the substance of accession, lists the respective rights of the two Governments in the sphere of external relations, defence and communications and establishment of responsible Government.

The controversy in regard to the over-riding authority claimed by the Dominion Government also appeared to have been satisfactorily resolved. Differences, however, appeared to persist in regard to the internal set-up in the State and the establishment of an interim Government pending convening of a Constituent Assembly.

Another important item included in the Government of India's proposals related to communal organisations in the State with particular reference to the Razakars. Its liquidation appeared to be *sine qua non* to any genuine understanding.

The text of the draft agreement and Firman will be found *in extenso* in Appendix "A".

The Hyderabad Cabinet after several requests to the Government of India to extend the time for acceptance eventually rejected the terms. The final reply came over by telephone to Delhi on June 22, on the eve of Lord Mountbatten's departure.

Thus ended the last great effort of Lord Mountbatten to produce a solution of the Hyderabad question.

Sir Walter Monckton's efforts in India also came to an end as his brief was only valuable to India due to the influence and prestige he carried at the Governor General's House.

Before Lord Mountbatten handed over charge he made one final attempt to induce the Nizam to accept the terms. Although the Nizam had treated him with scant courtesy by declining his invitation to visit him at Delhi, Lord Mountbatten put his pride in his pocket and wrote to His Exalted Highness to accept the draft agreement settled at Delhi. The plea fell on deaf ears.

Mr. I. S. Jehu, a British Editor of great repute, writing in the "Times of India" on the failure of the negotiations said :—

"The worst has been confirmed. Hyderabad has in fact rejected terms which are, in any reasonable and practical assessment of the circumstances, conspicuously generous. Let us be thankful that India's Prime Minister, faced by more than ordinary provocation, has refused to yield to human

impatience and has said, flatly and realistically, that the Government of India's last word has been offered. There is nothing more to be said. The Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam have obviously exhausted the patience not only of the Indian Union, but of anxious well-wisher like Earl Mountbatten, of their own adviser, Sir Walter Monckton, and even, to all appearances, of their own Prime Minister. Relations between the State and the Indian Union have come to a complete standstill, which means that an economic blockade becomes complete. Undoubtedly, India will suffer, but even in her current travail her difficulties will be of little consequence compared to the effects on Hyderabad. The Nizam's Government are embarking on a course which can take them nowhere, and have failed to take advantage of a moment when distinguished persons, palpably anxious to help them, are on the spot. An opportunity is being missed which will not recur; and if those in despotic power in Hyderabad fondly imagine that external help may be forthcoming, they are doomed to disastrous disillusion. Even should the worst happen—which nothing yet suggests—to the solidarity of the Indian Union nothing can save Hyderabad, save contemporary commonsense, from complete liquidation."

At a Press Conference, following the failure of the talks the Prime Minister indicated that Government would pursue an "open door policy," inasmuch as the proposals which they had forwarded to the Nizam

had not been withdrawn and it was open to the Nizam to accept them at any time he chooses. At the same time, Pandit Nehru declared, Government would not wait for anybody.

The terms contained in the draft proposals to the Nizam were the "uttermost limit to which the Government of India would go. They were not variable in any way."

The Prime Minister revealed that he had received a telegram from the Nizam's Government late that evening expressing their desire to continue the talks. But he said, there was no question of any further protracted negotiations—this had been made perfectly clear to them.

They could not come to an agreement with Hyderabad unless they knew that responsible government would prevail there, said the Prime Minister. It was inconceivable that, when the whole of India, the States and the provinces had adopted full responsible Government, Hyderabad should remain alone in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The only question was whether the change-over should come peacefully, co-operatively, or by trouble on a big scale.

At the final breakdown of the negotiations of June 22, Pandit Nehru declared his Government's determination not to re-open negotiations though he said that it had been left open for the Nizam to ratify the agreement. But the Nizam did not show any inclination to do so and did not go beyond his offer of parity between 15 per cent. (Muslims) and 85 per cent. (Hindus) of his population. It was then that, at a speech at Patiala on July 15, Sardar Patel said that the draft formula evolved by Lord

Mountbatten and Sir Walter Monckton and approved by the States Ministry and Hyderabad delegation, but subsequently turned down by the Nizam, did no longer hold the field. "Now the settlement with the Nizam will have to be on the lines of settlements with other states". This categorical statement was later reaffirmed by Pandit Nehru at Madras.

India had now no option but to clamp down an economic blockade on recalcitrant Hyderabad. As it was being reported that gun-running was being carried on a large scale into the State, the first step of the India Government was to deny arms and ammunition. Then they suspended aerial communications with a view mainly to prevent military supplies from being flown to Hyderabad. These were followed by economic and financial measures—*i.e.* ban on the transfer of securities held by or on behalf of the Nizam, prohibition of export of gold, jewellery and currency notes to Hyderabad and suspension of agency arrangements by the Imperial Bank—which were calculated to keep Hyderabad from using its resources against India.

Hopes of a settlement with the Nizam were once again raised early in August when fresh negotiations with the Government of India were started on behalf of the Nizam by Sir Mirza Ismail. But his mission came to nought owing to the opposition of the Razakar-controlled Hyderabad Council of Ministers and of Mir Laik Ali, in particular, who threatened to resign if these peace efforts were not put an end to forthwith. The Nizam's Agent-General in New Delhi, Nawab Zain Yar Jang, was forced to resign because he took a prominent part in the latest peace parleys.

The impression left by the repeated failure of the negotiations on independent observers and even

well-wishers of the Nizam was clearly adverse to Hyderabad regime. Sir Mirza Ismail, who had come to Delhi with the approval, if not at the express instance of the Nizam ascribed of his failure to the undemocratic forces at work in Hyderabad and the inability of the Nizam to act without reference to these forces.

On August 13, a demand for the immediate disbandment of the Razakar organisation and the dissolution of the present Government in Hyderabad was made by seven prominent Muslims of Hyderabad in a joint statement.

The statement, which was published in a local Urdu nationalist daily, urged the immediate setting up of an interim government enjoying the confidence of all communities in the State and immediate accession to the Indian Union in respect of the three subjects of external affairs, defence and communications.

The signatories to the statement included Nawab Manzoor Jung Bahadur, Mr. S. M. Hussain Jaffer, former Director of Public Instructions, Hyderabad, Mr. Ahmed Mirza, retired Chief Engineer, Nizam's Government, and Mr. Farid Mirza, Tehsildar of Khandar in Nanded district, who was reported to have resigned.

The statement said that the Hyderabad public has been misled to believe that the word accession meant slavery and subordination, whereas accession was only in respect of the three federal subjects on the basis of equality. Moreover, Hyderabad, by signing the standstill agreement, has already committed herself to accession. There was now no question of paramountcy.

The joint statement pointing out that there is a group among the Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen which believes in ceding the three subjects, says that otherwise the standstill agreement would not have been possible. A great part of Muslim intelligentsia in the State also believed that Hyderabad must act in co-operation with India even after the establishment of Pakistan.

The statement also said that the present Hyderabad Government had aggravated the existing ill-feeling in the country and by its intransigence over the Razakar problem, despite the clamour of the Hindu community, has fully exposed its communal bias by failing to institute an enquiry into the alleged Razakar atrocities. Besides, the Government had been unsuccessful in maintaining peace and order in the country and in establishing friendly relations with India. The present unhappy relations with the Indian Union had not only led to severe economic suffering of the people in the State but had retarded reconstruction work.

The only reply that the Hyderabad Government gave to the statement was to dismiss some of the signatories from the State service, stop the pensions of others and clap all the signatories into prison under the Defence of Hyderabad Rules. Mr. Shebullah Khan, Editor of the "Imroz" journal, who dared to publish the statement was murdered. A written warning was also given to other editors that any opposition to the Razakars or the policy of the Ittehad would be punished by death.

The disgust of the Indian Muslims at the activities of the Razakar clique in Hyderabad affairs was expressed by the demand for the deposition of the Nizam by the Maharajkumar of Mahmudabad,

former President of the United Provinces Muslim League and closest associate of Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

The Maharajkumar said, "The Nizam may choose to go to U. N., to heaven, or to hell, but the Government of India should not remain mute spectators of the atrocities in the State. The defenceless population of Hyderabad, if not saved in time, may have strong grounds to make the Government of India answerable before the world bar. Without loosing time any more it is now the duty of the Government of India to depose the Nizam immediately and to establish responsible government in the State."

The view point of the saner elements of the British Press is typified in a recent article in the "New Statesman and Nation" which said that had the British still been in India and had the Nizam then worked in close concert with so blood-thirsty a communal Fascist as Kasim Razvi and defied the Central Government, undoubtedly the Nizam would have been deposed. "We cannot complain," said the journal, "if India wishes to do the same". The journal denied that Britain made any pledges to the Princes when they withdrew from India. "We could not have given any guarantee, even if we had so desired."

Excepting, therefore, in hired quarters, the case of the Nizam carries neither merit nor conviction.

CHAPTER IX

THE HYDERABAD, PAKISTAN AND THE MIDDLE EAST.

As mentioned elsewhere, Lord Mountbatten sent a friendly invitation to the Nizam to come to Delhi. The only reply he got was an impertinent counter invitation to Hyderabad.

If the Nizam had done the same in Lord Reading's time, he would have found himself brought to Delhi by half a dozen police constables and Razvi would have either fled the State or been detained under the extensive powers of an ancient regulation.

But the Nizam after having signed Delhi to a Standstill went ahead with his plans to form alliances and import arms.

He had friends in Pakistan. Jinnah had been his lawyer and advisor before he became too great to accept a fee ; then Monckton came on the scene. Ghulam Mohammad, Finance Minister of Pakistan had been the Finance Member of Hyderabad before Jinnah picked him up for appointment. The Nizam knew Jinnah would need money for Pakistan and Jinnah knew where he could get it. Both the Nizam and Jinnah were inspired by the same ideology of expansion at the expense of their common neighbour. Both were prepared to pool brains, resources and, if necessary, arms.

A strong Pakistan was a guarantee to the Nizam ; an independent Hyderabad was indispensable to Pakistan.

It has long been evident that Hyderabad derives its courage, perhaps, less from the filibuster of Razvi than from certain sinister forces gathering to a head outside the frontiers of India.

It is thus against the ampler world background that we should view the Hyderabad tangle and the closely related issue of Kashmir. The two Powers greatly interested in world hegemony are careful of the oil of the Middle East, and at the same time apprehensive of Russian influence extending over the Muslim and other areas of Asia. With India kept up in a state of internal convulsions, the way would be easy to play off the various Muslim powers.

In an alliance of Muslim States of the Middle East—and Pakistan—a certain foreign policy sees not only oil for West Powers but bases close to the heart of Russia and Communism. Hence the Arab Legion under the British personnel and a Royal welcome to the Shah of Persia in the Western Capitals of Europe.

An equally significant visit was that of Sir Mohammed Zafarullah of Damascus, after his long absence at Lake Success when it might have been reasonably thought that matters of moment at home awaited his attention.

Another mysterious and sinister trip was that of Lord Mountbatten's Press Attache to Hyderabad, soon followed by his betaking himself to England. Since the personal impressions we gathered at Hyderabad are now lost to us, it is to be presumed they were never meant for us, but that he would add his "expert" knowledge to the ready willingness of British Tory Leaders to bolster up the pretensions of Hyderabad. Even Dr. Grady, ex-U. S. Ambassador who might

have been expected to keep himself off the ground tried to use the forum of the Ootacamund Conference to present a view of the Hyderabad trouble which was as amazing as it is derogatory to the Government of the Union.

Patrick Maitland, the very well-informed Fleet Street commentator, genuinely justified by the event, referred to Sir Mohammad Zafarullah's statement that Pakistan would "effectively resist" the creation of a Jewish State, because Jewish disturbances will endanger peace in the Asian continent. Zafarullah's unwillingness to be drawn further was explained by Maitland this way. Pakistan's Foreign Minister was awaiting King Abdullah's fateful choice "whether to press on with his overtures to Israel and smooth the path by accepting a truce, or to give way to the pressure of the Arab League, in general, the Mufti in particular and Islam at large." And it is established that Zafarullah visited Damascus because "matters as vital to Pakistan's aspirations as anything that now occurs in Kashmir are now in play."

A triangular contest among King Abdullah, the Mufti and Mr. Jinnah for the leadership of Islamic World is evidently going on, backed by oil-mad Western powers. And here, from piecing together available scraps of intelligence, it is inferred that Mr. Jinnah has "made powerful and enticing overtures to the world's richest monarch, the Nizam of Hyderabad, to lend his support to the resumption of Islam's protection of Holy Places and to secure the resurrection of the Caliphate in favour of his grandson," who is the son of the daughter of the last Caliph and hence a direct descendant of the Prophet.

In support of this view we are reminded not only of the Nizam's loan to Pakistan but of the rumours of

the Nizam transferring important quantities of his moveable riches to Karachi for safe-keeping, the Mufti's closer relations with Pakistan and Sir Mohammed Zafarullah's own avoidance of Abdullah's Court.

During World War II, Indian troops saved Iraq, Syria, Iran and Egypt from the Axis menace. The communications in Iraq are mostly of Indian construction, and even now there are Indian technical staff in the Iraqi State Railways, although in some cases, they have acquired Iraqi citizenship. There are hundreds of Indian traders too in most of the Middle Eastern countries.

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's, the Arab States looked towards the Indian nationalist movement for inspiration for their own liberation movements. Some of these countries sent fraternal delegates to the annual sessions of the Congress and supported our anti-imperialist line. Many an important Arab leader is known to Indian Statesmen, notably Pandit Nehru, and had kind thoughts for India.

But that position has changed during the past two or three years. Ever since the rise of the Pakistan movement, minds of the people in the Middle East have been poisoned by vicious anti-Indian propaganda by pan-Islamic dreamers, usually reactionary elements in the social life of those countries, who wish to exploit the Islamic sentiments of the illiterate masses, in order to divert their minds from important social problems.

Pakistan being the latest Islamic state, the Muslim masses there feel attracted towards the Muslims of Pakistan. Pakistan's verbal condemnation of Zionism

and India's attitude towards the Palestine problem further cement the relations between our neighbour and the Islamic states ; sections of public in the Middle Eastern States have come to support Pakistan's stand, right or wrong, in regard to India.

Following the partition of India, therefore, the Kashmir problem and the Hyderabad issue, the venom of anti-Indian propaganda, in the Middle East has reached an amazing crescendo. Typical of the venom, poured out against India have been the articles in "Al Jabl" an Arabic Daily of Baghdad. Not long ago "Al Jabl" published on its front page a facsimile letter written by Pakistani in Arabic. It described the atrocities graphically. Biassed reportage on the Kashmir fighting in Kashmir and presentation of one side the picture of Indo-Pakistan relations have been a feature of this newspaper for quite a long time.

In an article on the assassination of Gandhiji, it portrayed him as the greatest enemy of the Muslims and blamed him for their massacre in Delhi and Eastern Punjab. It said :

"His religion prevents him from killing any living being, be it an insect or flea, but he declared the necessity of waging a war against the Islamic State of Pakistan. On August 19, 1947, the general carnage of Muslims began in Eastern Punjab, and in Delhi, the capital of Hindu India, thousand of Muslim women were abducted."

It goes on : "It was on Gandhiji's advice that Sikhs planned and executed the great carnage, killed more than a million Muslims while women have been inhumanly

manhandled, tortured and raped, little children killed before their mother's eyes. Between August 15th and March 1st, 6,950 houses were burnt, 4,698 arrests, 442 women raped, 17 women killed".

The article concluded: "We remind the Muslims of Iraq of the attitude adopted by Pakistan towards the Muslim question and of the readiness shown by them to help our brethren in Palestine. Listen to the voice of the leaders of Pakistan when they boycott Jewish and American goods, when they raise their voice in the defence of Palestine".

"In the near future, you may see Pakistan troops marching side by side with the Arabs to rescue the Holy Land. Had there been no fighting in Kashmir, even to-day we would have seen Pakistan's shedding their blood in order to rescue us from the clutches of criminal Zionists. In India, the criminal Arya Samaj endeavours to imitate the Zionists and co-operate with them to divide the Muslims".

The Union Government will, of course, receive the unstinted support and sympathy of the country in the very difficult and dangerous crisis that confronts them. Partly it has been due to their inexpert handling of the situation, whether in Hyderabad or Kashmir—the two hang much closer than was at one time thought possible—and partly to the failure of our various Ambassadors to keep the Government fully posted with the currents of opinion abroad. Eventually it comes to this that we have been misled by what Mrs. Pandit styled "our news".

It was Aristotle, many centuries ago, who settled the foundations of a State's foreign policy: to form beneficial alliances with foreign powers and to prevent the enemy from making alliances.

Whether it is our "newness" to international intrigues or the difficult position we are placed in a world of conflicting ideologies, none of which we can wholly accept, we have made no new friends; we have lost friendships which were of value to us; while our enemies have made alliances, which may eventually lead to our discomfiture.

Greater disaster than the mass migration of millions from the East and the West Punjab may well have overtaken us, if the Palestine question had not descended as a heaven-sent relief to our foreign policy. "Jihad" in the Middle East became more important than "Jihad" in Kashmir or over Hyderabad!

The Nizam's waiting for a period of a year has not resulted in all that he had hoped for. True he has been able to fly in some arms, augment the irregular forces in the State and raise the number of Razakars from a quarter of a million to half a million; carry his appeal to the U. N. O., and draw international attention by a debate in the House of Commons.

But circumstances, more than action on the part of the States Ministry, have applied the brakes.

The recognition of Israel by both America and Russia broke the British support to the Arab cause in Palestine—and victories on the field were nullified by diplomatic pressure.

Jinnah and the Nizam did their best to keep their

interests in the Middle East alive in the hope that one good turn begets another. The Nizam remitted ten lakhs to Abdullah for Arab refugees and Pakistan refused recognition to Israel and proclaimed the despatch of a unit to fight with the Arab Legion for the return of Holy Places.

Moreover Jinnah found himself in serious difficulties at home. The Khan of Kalat, like the Nizam, refused to accede, proclaimed his independence and sought international recognition.

Kalat hoped for support from the Government of India but in vain. India did not make an alliance with him for fear that the Nizam would ally himself with Pakistan in return. But India lost a valuable friend and the Nizam has got all the support he needs from Pakistan. Kalat was crushed into accession but the matter is far from settled. Jinnah's bombs have frequently to be used to underline the accession.

Pakistan's difficulties at home have not been confined to Kalat. Afghanistan has claims and ambitions and is not confined by Jinnah's pleas that they should consider Pakistan a Muslim State and forego all territorial claims. Afghanistan also supports the movement to establish an independent Pathan State on the Western Frontiers of Pakistan, a State not dominated by Punjabis, Sindhis and Bengalis. The Faqir of Ipi had in the past to be frequently bombed into silence but he continued to live, in spite of the Royal Air Force. That he will continue to flourish in spite of the Royal Pakistan Air Force may be taken for granted.

Jinnah himself reported sick and dying has quickened the pace of esoteric tendencies within Pakistan.

India is playing a game of "wait and see." It may be by accident in the long run prove the wisest—but it may on the other hand prove the least wise. At times patience is virtue—in time of stress it may lead to disaster. The Palestine question may be settled ; Jinnah may recover ; Britain may recall Churchill ; the Tories may need Pakistan and Hyderabad and then the entire shapes in the Asiatic kalaedescopes may change.

CHAPTER X

HYDERABAD OR INDIA

The failure of the negotiations ended in an anti-climax. Those who thought that war would follow the failure were doomed to disappointment. The Prime Minister in a speech soon after the failure of the talks said that while his Government would not be stampeded into action so far as Hyderabad was concerned, he felt confident that owing to its geographical position, Hyderabad could never be independent.

He added that the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and Razakars by their action tried to give a communal colour through their activities, but he asserted that it was absolutely a political issue, the issue being the freedom of the people of Hyderabad and the establishment of a democratic self-government there.

Somewhat unnecessarily, Pandit Nehru reminded Hyderabad of India's basic policies that his Government would never coerce any State to accede to the Indian Union.

Referring to British policy which was responsible for creating more than 600 States in the Indian Dominion, Pandit Nehru said that there were at present not more than 30 States, the rest having either merged with bigger States or with Indian Union Provinces.

Pandit Nehru ridiculed Socialist pleadings for armed intervention here now and pointed out how the advocates of such policy were oblivious

of the complexities which such intervention would bring in its train.

While he asked the people not to follow blindly the Central and Provincial Government's policy, he exhorted them to offer positive and constructive suggestions and hoped that criticisms should have relation to facts and not cognizance of gossips.

In Hyderabad the failure of the negotiations was construed as a triumph. Razvi said he was glad they were through with this business : accession was dead.

India, however, held the door open. But Laik Ali and Razvi did not come anywhere near it.

They were not concerned with India so much now as with Britain and Pakistan. Would the arms the Nizam had purchased be delivered ?

It was not until late in July that the Government of India awoke to the reality and seriousness of the gunrunning that was going on between Pakistan and Hyderabad.

And if they knew of it, it is strange they did nothing about it earlier.

In a pamphlet published in April there was the categorical statement.

" While these projects are being blue-printed and hatched, there has taken place a large influx of foreign advisers, administrators, technicians and military officers. Aircraft, carrying supplies and personnel, are landing in Hyderabad direct from Karachi. Reports appearing in the Indian press have indicated

that many of the gangs which raid villages on the Indian border are officered by "Whites" and are armed with the latest weapons. Those who have seen some of the modern equipment carried by the raiders in Kashmir, equipment which has appeared on the battlefield for the first time, will be able to understand the real meaning of these scraps of evidence. Without doubt, a Asaf Jah is once again drawing his sword in the defence of British interests."

In Bombay it was also well known that the planes were flying out to sea from Pakistan, and inland across Goa. The Government of India were apparently not in the know or did not treat the menace as serious.

It was not till July that the Dominion administration awoke to the reality that the deft negotiations carried on by the Nizam had been a smoke screen for gun-running.

Sidney Cotton's cargo of medical supplies was the last and least objectionable of the consignment.

Hopes that a compromise of the Hyderabad problem may be found are day by day receding. At the moment there seems little prospect of carrying on negotiations any further and if carried on the chance of a settlement over the conference table are far from good.

What next ?

Hyderabad or India ?

It is clear that the way things have drifted it must be either. It cannot be both.

Razvi and his gang have seen to that.

In the present state of uncertainty, we cannot do better than analyse some of the factors that are at work and which must inevitably solve the problem one way or the other.

Basically speaking, the Government of India's foremost concern has been and still is, that Hyderabad constituting, as it does, the 'belly' of the Indian Dominion, should not become a disease spot and imperil the whole country. Neither Pandit Nehru nor Sardar Patel intended to interfere with the internal management of the State so long as it was conducted on democratic and progressive lines. All that the Dominion is interested in has been the maintenance of a state of affairs in Hyderabad and of relationship between Hyderabad and the Dominion which would cause no anxiety regarding the defence of the country, its arterial communications and its political integrity. According to a well-informed correspondent accession and responsible Government are but two facets of the Indian Dominions.' fundamental anxiety with regard to Hyderabad.

Ignoring legal expositions and historical claims, the Nizam's desire has from the start been to exploit the circumstances of the transfer of power from Britain to India so as to carve out for himself a status of independent Kingdom, no doubt with greatly extended boundaries. The Government of India could not but complain against this attitude. If the Nizam's claim to sovereignty is conceded it must be a prelude to conceding to him the overlordship of the Deccan—with consequences of the most serious character. Razvi might live to plant the Nizam's flag on the Red Fort at Delhi. The situation with all its perils calls for bold action on the part of the Government of India,

The cautious policy of the Government of India, however, is due largely in the main to the defeatist mentality of prominent personalities. Many of them see in an armed conflict the destruction of valuable properties in Ahmedabad and Bombay. Some are prepared to barter principles for an uncertain peace.

Typical of the defeatist mentality was an article "Hyderabad planted a time bomb" in a Bombay journal under the pen of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, a member of the Congress Working Committee :

"A breach is a break whether it relates to a failure to withdraw troops or to a blockade of supplies. Then, why should it be on a minor scale? Why not straight-away declare war and be finished with the whole affair in a fortnight? It is widely rumoured that Mountbatten stated that he could finish the campaign in a jiffy. We have enough military talent and leadership apart from the vaunted prowess of a hesitating friend. But then what are the consequences of such a desperate step?

"Even leaving a wide margin for Razvi's flamboyant threat that the invading Indian Army will have only to collect ashes of the Hindu population of Hyderabad, the fact remains that the first reactions of an armed attack upon Hyderabad cannot but be the visitation of the 'sins' of India upon the innocent Hindus of the State. Any hesitancy on the part of the Union forces in taking drastic action against the state forces for fear of injury to the innocents in the state would prolong the agony and

any ment the damage. Invading armies must perform the task in the twinkling of an eye by simultaneous action at strategic points. All the same there will be indescribable suffering. The near and distant repercussions of open warfare should be considered.

“The news of Hindus being butchered in Hyderabad is apt to endanger the lives of the 35 millions of our Muslim brethren all over India and the pogroms of September, 1947, may pale into insignificance before their enlarged and intensified edition of 1948. It is feared that this may in turn lead to a mass exodus of the one crore and twenty-five lakhs of Hindus from East Bengal to West Bengal—the most densely populated area in India with over 750 per square mile and which may become the scene of another man-made famine.”

The tragedy of the situation is that the haunting fear of consequences is confined to Indian leaders. Razvi and the Nizam don't care a little what happens to anybody; they are prepared to get their independence by brow-beating and bluster if possible; by massacre, fire and arson, if necessary.

If Jinnah could establish Pakistan by eliminating seven million Hindus and Sikhs from Western Pakistan, Razvi sees no insuperable difficulty in the elimination of twelve million Scheduled and non-Scheduled Hindus from Osmanistan.

Genocide has become a recognised weapon in the armoury of Aligarh political theory.

The opponents of war also argue that the moment

the Union forces proceed against Hyderabad, Pakistan will intensify its aid to Kashmir where the fighting will become more severe. And if, in addition, Pakistan should take to aggression in the West and the East we shall have a three thousand-mile frontier to defend. Though we may easily drive back the Pakistan forces to Lahore, it is argued, that we shall have to carry on a long-drawn fight in the city with every house as a citadel and every citizen as a soldier. "It will be another Stalingrad. Not that the Union will be frightened out of its duty, but a wise Government should never underrate the enemy's strength." The Dominion Government have thus since August last pursued a policy of conciliation which has provoked their critics to charge them with weakness. The fact, however, is that, apart from their lofty intentions, they have all along been anxious to avoid an open clash with Hyderabad. This is manifest from the manner in which the Standstill Agreement was concluded last November and from the incredible toleration displayed by the Government of India in face of repeated acts of provocation.

The average man sees in the policy of hesitation of the Dominion only a concession to flibuster and bullying from Hyderabad. To him war seems the only answer and the earlier it is taken in hand the better. Strong votaries of this view-point are the Socialists under the leadership of Jai Prakash Narain and Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali.

Speaking at Nagpur in June, the Socialist President said that there was no other alternative before the Government of India except that of declaring war against the Nizam. He added :—

"Hyderabad State is not a free country and the Government of India should have taken

this step months ago. My grievance is that the Government of India are not taking any action and, by their vacillation and weakness, have only helped the Nizam."

But in spite of socialists and their pressure, India has pursued a defensive role. Despite provocations from the Razakars and the Nizam's troops and police, the Indian Government has taken few retaliatory measures. How long the patience of the people of India will accept that this policy is the right policy remains to be seen. There is no sign yet of wisdom dawning on those in power in Hyderabad. In the ultimate analysis India will have to adopt a positive policy in the interests both of her own peace and security and of the well-being of the suppressed people of Hyderabad. Tolerance and patience, founded on goodwill and statesmanship, do not seem to be understood in Hyderabad.

The Indian people rightly demand a straight and sensible answer from responsible men as to why a policy of procrastination is being pursued by a powerful Government against a puny state, when they are declaredly quite willing to fight to the last man and the last rupee to uphold the honour of their motherland and protect the life and property of their brothers and sisters across the frontier. In the absence of a convincing explanation India's remissness at the psychological moment might be condemned by future generations as the result of vacillation of mind where firmness of heart, where sternness of hand, was called for.

Why have the Government at the centre given room for such allegations ? Are they diffident of their own strength to overpower the Nizam's forces or are there

unexpected complications which may widen the range of hostilities in case of war ? Is it possible that inter-provincial and even international complications will ensue ? Is it apprehended that the civil repercussions themselves are likely to be serious and forbidding ? It is necessary to deal with these aspects of the problem.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, in a 90-minute speech before a vast, mixed crowd at Naini Tal, recently, referred to the Hyderabad and Kashmir issues : Indo-Pakistan problems.

Pandit Nehru said that independent Hyderabad full of dangers to India. Accession of Hyderabad to India would mean that " we give it a place of honour and dignity and make it our partner to share the country's freedom".

Pandit Nehru declared that Hyderabad, which had been created in what was known as Britishers' Indian State system, had refused to fall in line with other sister Indian States in merging into Provinces and its vast population was still under one-man rule and feudal and dictatorial laws prevailed there.

Pandit Nehru made it clear that the Indian Government did not wish to interfere in the administration of Hyderabad, but at the same time they would not permit any foreign power or agency or vested interest to establish themselves in the State. Such a course, he said, would be a challenge to the security of India.

Pandit Nehru was cheered when he said there was talk of a completely independent and sovereign Hyderabad. That was absurd talk. Hyderabad could be independent only if India died and never before.

Pandit Nehru alluded to the people's struggle for independence in Indian States and said that the impact of those forces was already being felt in Hyderabad. One man alone could not any more guide the destiny of Hyderabad people.

Pandit Nehru said with some emphasis, "we have always before us the picture of ideal India. Keeping that picture in mind, we shall force the pace and face any impediment that may come in our way in solving the Hyderabad issue."

Without, however, in any way, detracting from the warnings of the Prime Minister, we must remember that these threats mean little or nothing to the wild men of Hyderabad. At the April Session of the All India Congress Committee at Bombay, Pandit Nehru in as clear words as possible threatened war if accession was not forthcoming. But accession did not follow and war is still debated.

Razvi and the Ittehad are convinced that the Indian Union does not mean war. In a speech at Hyderabad at the occasion of Independence Day Razvi said the Indian Union would never risk a war.

Many people in the Union unfortunately are beginning to think the same.

But war is inevitable. If the Indian Union has not the heart to declare war, Razvi will, not to-day, perhaps, but tomorrow or the day after. He may want a few weeks' time until he is more definitely assured of Pakistan help or foreign support. The Nizam has powerful allies in Pakistan and in London. Razvi has a cause and the Nizam has claims—stupid, frivolous and dishonest though they

be. But have not stupid, frivolous and dishonest claims been the foundations of a war before.

It must inevitably be either Hyderabad or India.

India must live.

APPENDIX " A."

The final texts of the " Draft Agreement " and the " Firman " negotiated at Delhi by the Hyderabad Delegation with the Government of India and carried by Mir Laik Ali and Sir Walter Monckton to Hyderabad on June 14 for the Nizam's signature. After prolonged deliberations by the Hyderabad Cabinet the terms were rejected.

The Draft Agreement said :

1. The Nizam's Government agree that they will, on the request of the Government of India, pass legislation similar to the legislation of the Government of India on any matter enumerated in the schedule attached.

2. If the Nizam's Government fail to pass the required legislation with due despatch, the Nizam himself will forthwith pass the necessary ordinance under his own powers.

3. The Dominion Government agree to fix the strength of the Hyderabad Army at a figure not exceeding an over-all strength of 20,000. The provisions of the Indian State Forces Scheme of 1939 will apply *mutatis mutandis* to these forces, and the Government of India undertake to supply arms, ammunition and equipment on the scale and conditions laid down in the scheme. The Government of India will have the right of periodical inspection, and the Nizam's Government will also give all facilities in regard to such inspection and furnish such information and returns as they may be requested to do by the Government of India from time to time.

4. The Nizam's Government agree to limit their irregular forces to 8,000 in addition to the ceremonial and household guards. The Hyderabad Government agree that all other formations of a military character shall be disbanded. Progressive steps will be taken for the disbandment of the Razakars within three months ; rallies, parades, demonstrations and speeches by the Razakars will cease forthwith.

5. It is agreed that the Government of India will not station their armed forces inside Hyderabad State ; but if in an emergency the Government of India wish to station their forces inside the State for the period of a state of emergency declared in India by the Government of India under Section 102 of the Government of India Act, 1935, this will be agreed to by the Hyderabad Government. In such an event, it is further agreed that the Government of India will be willing to pay to Hyderabad nominal compensation for the occupation of buildings in the State and for other services.

6. If in any emergency as above, Indian Army units are stationed in Hyderabad State, they will be subject to the appropriate Dominion law governing the armed forces of the Dominion.

7. It is agreed that Hyderabad's external relations with any foreign country shall be conducted by the Government of India. Hyderabad will, however, have freedom to establish trade agencies in order to build up commercial, fiscal and economic relations with other countries ; but these agencies will work under the general supervision of, and in the closest co-operation with, the Government of India.

Hyderabad will not have any political relations with any country.

8. Subject to the above paragraphs, the existing agreements and administrative arrangements in regard to matters of common concern shall continue, and will be given effect to by both sides. These agreements and arrangements shall not cease to have effect on November 29, 1948, as was provided in Article V of the Standstill Agreement of November 29, 1947.

SCHEDULE “ A ”

- 1. Any armed forces raised or maintained by Hyderabad, whether within or without the State.**
- 2. Naval, military, and air force works.**
- 3. Arms, fire-arms, ammunition.**
- 4. Explosives.**

SCHEDULE " B "

External Affairs.

1. External Affairs, the implementing of treaties and agreements with other countries, extradition.
2. Admission into, and emigration and expulsion from, Hyderabad, including in relation thereto the regulation of the movements in Hyderabad of persons who are not Hyderabad subjects.
3. Naturalisation.

SCHEDULE "C"

Communications.

1. Posts and Telegraphs, including Telephones, Wireless, broadcasting, and other like forms of communication.
2. Railways of the Government of India in the State ; the regulation of the Nizam's State Railways in respect of safety, maximum and minimum rates and fares, station and service and terminal charges ; interchange of traffic and the responsibility of the railway administrations as carriers of goods and passengers ; the regulation of other railways in the State in respect of safety, the responsibility of the administration of such railways as carriers of goods and passengers.
3. Aircraft and navigation ; regulation and organisation of air traffic and aerodromes ; provisions for the safety of aircraft ; carriage of passengers and goods by air.

Draft of Nizam's "Firman".

The following is the Draft "Firman" that was to have been issued by the Nizam in the State, following the signing of the agreement between India and Hyderabad :

1. "After protracted discussion between my Government and the Government of India, I am now in a position to announce the lines of my policy. I am most anxious to put an end to the uncertainties which prevail as to the nature of the relationship between Hyderabad and the Dominion of India. The views of the Dominion of India have been made clear to me, and mine are well known to the world. I have now decided to consult the will of my people upon the question whether Hyderabad should accede to India. I shall, therefore, take a plebiscite. Hyderabad on the basis of a plebiscite is the only basis on which it can be fairly conducted, and I shall ensure that the plebiscite is held under the supervision of some impartial and independent body. I shall accept the result of the plebiscite, whatever it may be.
2. "But I am satisfied that more is required than the holding of a plebiscite, in order to restore confidence and tranquillity. I have, therefore, decided to instruct my Government to proceed in accordance with the following principles. In doing so, they will appreciate that the re-establishment of

goodwill between India and Hyderabad is the object of my policy and is of greater importance than the terms of any agreement which may be reached between India and Hyderabad in accordance with these principles —

- (i) “It is my intention to introduce responsible Government in Hyderabad, and to that end, to establish a Constituent Assembly early in 1949.
- (ii) “In the meantime, there should be a reconstitution of my Government, as the result of which a new interim Government will be formed, in consultation with the leaders of the major political parties.
- (iii) “My Government have been able to reach agreement with the Government of India on the nature of the interim relationship between Hyderabad and India pending the holding of the plebiscite. This agreement, which involves some modifications of the existing Standstill Agreement, has been embodied in a separate document signed by my Prime Minister”.

